

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 18, 1985

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend Robert L. Tate, rector, Christ Episcopal Church on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all goodness and love, so guide the leaders of the nations of the Earth, and especially the elected Representatives of the United States of America gathered here today, that the words they speak may echo Your Holy Word, and the laws which they enact may correspond to Your Holy Law. Inspire, we pray, the Members of this House with the spirit of wisdom and truth, that they may be worthy of their high calling as servants of the American public, and may work diligently to establish peace and justice for all Your people, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with You, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REV. ROBERT L. TATE

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my profound gratitude to you and to our Chaplain, Reverend Ford, for having given the opportunity today to say the official prayer as the chaplain of the day to Rector Robert L. Tate of the Christ Episcopal Church here in Washington on the Hill.

As my colleagues could see, he is a mere 34 years of age, but one of the most inspiring figures I have seen in the ministry. I think that we are most privileged today in the House to have had the prayer offered in behalf of the Congress and the country by this inspired, young minister, so imbued with his calling that anyone within his area of influence cannot help but be susceptible to it.

He has an illustrious record of preparation. He graduated summa cum laude from Princeton and the Yale School of Divinity. He is married to a graduate of Brown University who is teaching at the Cathedral here in Washington.

So it is most inspiring to see this young minister, a man of God truly speaking, so dedicated, because I think it is the greatest insurance we have in our country for our own continued and ultimate well being and ultimate salvation.

Christ Episcopal Church is the most historic church in Washington. It was the first congregation established around 1794 in an old tobacco warehouse. I invite my colleagues to visit the present Christ Episcopal Church. It is here on the Hill near the Marine Barracks. You will be inspired and hopefully will establish some communication and friendship with Rector Robert Tate.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Dozens of laudatory speeches and celebrations will be held this week to hail the occasion.

But I wonder why everyone is celebrating?

In truth, what the record of the past four decades shows is that the United Nations is a far different organization today than when it was founded with 50 nations in 1945.

In the beginning, the United Nations dared to stand up to Communist aggression and even go to battle to preserve freedom for a small, helpless nation, South Korea.

Today, with its membership swelled to 159 nations, the United Nations does not possess the strength or unity to chastise global adventurism anywhere and, instead, has become a platform for some of the most virulent anti-Americanism seen anywhere on this Earth.

If the United Nations were to be graded on its success in its founding goals of promoting freedom, fostering international peace and aiding in the development of ties between diverse countries in the world, it would receive an "F" for failure on all counts.

We should not be celebrating but instead calling for reform or, possibly, the dismantlement of this organization which has failed in 40 years to accomplish what it set out to do.

LET US REOPEN THE BUDGET DEBATE

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, last night President Reagan spoke again about foreign trade, but again he offered nothing to reduce \$200 billion deficits, nothing to lower interest rates, and nothing to bring down the value of the dollar.

These deficits have turned our country, for the first time in 71 years, into a debtor nation. They cause the dollar to be overvalued by as much as 40 percent, which means a 40-percent advantage for Japan and other foreign competitors.

Mr. Speaker, it is a copout, a delusion, to pretend we can solve our trade problem without addressing our budget problems. I say to my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, free traders and protectionists, let us deal honestly and courageously with these deficits.

I would propose that we reopen the budget debate and make a bold, honest and bipartisan attempt to deal with deficits. Otherwise, we are only kidding ourselves about trade, imposing hardship on farmers and workers, and leaving the cost and even greater pain to our children.

REVOLUTION BEYOND OUR BORDERS

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been a number of unsubstantiated charges made by the Government of Nicaragua that the U.S. Government has participated in state-sponsored terrorism against the Marxist Sandinista regime currently in power in Nicaragua. Nothing could be further from the truth, and in fact it is the Sandinistas who have supported terrorist acts against their neighbors in an attempt to destabilize the entire region.

The true extent of the Sandinistas' lies and hypocrisy is revealed in a recent publication by the Department of State entitled "Revolution Beyond Our Borders—Sandinista Intervention in Central America," which has been sent to every Member's office. I recommend this publication as required reading for every Member of Congress.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

who is truly interested in understanding the situation in Central America.

This report refutes claims by the Sandinistas that they never engaged in aggression against their neighbors by detailing Sandinista efforts to unify guerrilla groups in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala; provision, train, direct and advise guerrillas in El Salvador; insert guerrilla groups into Honduras, and sustain radical anti-democratic parties and associated armed elements in Costa Rica.

This demonstrates why the United States was forced to end its previously friendly relations with the Government of Nicaragua and instead support the freedom fighters in order to halt the Sandinista policies of aggression against their neighbors.

□ 1110

THE NEED FOR A SENSIBLE TRADE POLICY AND THE WILL TO IMPLEMENT IT

(Mr. LUNDINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, in his news conference last night, President Reagan said:

For almost two years now, I have been begging our allies and trading partners in the GATT to join with us in another round of trade talks to again eliminate whatever holdovers there are of discrimination against someone else's products getting into their country or subsidizing the sale at less than production cost in other countries.

Do not beg, Mr. President. You should insist that we and our trading partners level the international trade playing field. The United States has the largest market in the world and the strongest military on the globe. This is a President who is willing to commit troops to Central America and to put nuclear weapons in space, yet he refuses to take trade actions to force our trading partners to open their markets to U.S. goods, stop their unfair trading practices, and come to some reasonable accommodation on the grossly inflated value of the U.S. dollar.

We cannot rely on begging our partners to get things done. Nor should we. Our trading partners need our market more than we need theirs. We need leadership. We need a sensible trade policy and the tough commitment from our President to implement it. Since the President refuses to do so, Congress must now take the leadership to develop a trade strategy that can reduce the disastrous \$150 billion Reagan trade deficit in the years to come.

THE LESSON OF THE CITRUS-PASTA WAR

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States fought a trade war this summer, and we won it.

In response to unfair European Economic Community tariffs on U.S. citrus products, the President raised the U.S. tariff on European pasta which is subsidized for export to this country.

After some angry rhetoric and high level discussions, a truce was declared. The pasta tariff was suspended until October 31 and the EEC has agreed to eliminate the pasta subsidy and give fair tariff treatment to U.S. citrus.

Mr. Speaker, the citrus-pasta war serves as a small example of how this country can achieve fair trade without resorting to legislated protectionism. The lesson learned this summer will now be applied to Japanese restrictions on United States leather and tobacco and on EEC restrictions of canned fruit imports. We must put our trading partners on notice: unfair trade practices will be met by a swift U.S. response.

Mr. Speaker, in considering trade legislation, let us work to strengthen the hand of our U.S. Trade Representative so he may negotiate for market access and an end to unfair foreign trade practices. But let's not enact mindless protectionist measures that simply allow American companies to avoid the pressures of foreign competition.

CONFUSION WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION ON TRADE ISSUES

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week the Vice President said, regarding the administration's position on trade, "We have made it clear that we are not kidding. No more Mr. Nice Guy." Last night the President warned, in terms of trade, against starting down a slippery slope of impulsive acts and imprudent judgment.

Well, which one is the administration's position? There is confusion here. But there is worse than confusion within the administration, there is insensitivity.

The President last night also talked about a mindless stampede toward protectionism.

Mr. Speaker, there has been another mindless stampede going on in this country—the loss of several million industrial jobs and losses on the farmlands of America. We have to worry about them as well as not repeating

the mistakes of Smoot-Hawley. Mr. President, I say, in response to your talk of last night and your comments at your press conference, that to protect America is not protectionism.

THE THREAT OF A REPEAT OF SMOOT-HAWLEY

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, last night the President was right when he warned the American people of a mindless stampede toward protectionism which will lead to a reenactment of the Great Depression. As the President stated, the Depression of the 1930's was brought on by snowballing protectionist legislation, symbolized by the highly restrictive Smoot-Hawley tariff.

No one meant to write Smoot-Hawley in the 1930's, and after learning the lessons of the Depression in the 1930's, I believe no one intends to write another, but pressure is building in the Congress to reconstruct Smoot-Hawley piece by piece. The first piece may be a textile and apparel bailout. The next piece may be a footwear bill or possibly a 25-percent surcharge. Bit by bit we will find ourselves slipping down the slope of Smoot-Hawley protectionism right into a depression.

Our economy is the healthiest in the world. That is why the world wants to invest its money here. We have created over 8 million jobs since 1980 while Europe has lost jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let us not ruin this fine economic performance by reconstructing Smoot-Hawley protectionism.

Mr. Speaker, the President understands that you cannot compensate for the long-term loss of international markets by our most productive industries by giving the false promise of short-run gains for our less productive and less competitive industries.

THE NATIONAL DEBT—MORE THAN AN ACCOUNTING PROBLEM

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, unlike my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, I saw the President's news conference last night as an attempt to dismiss our Nation's new status as a debtor nation as little more than an accounting problem. My concern is that Mr. Reagan does not understand the problem nor does he understand the dangers we now face as a debtor nation.

Our new debtor status is something that has been confirmed, not by

economists and politicians, but by the President's own Secretary of Commerce in his report this week which shows that America now owes more than is owed to us.

If Mr. Reagan would travel to my hometown of Osceola, AR, and stand at the gates of its closed textile mills, where over 900 citizens lost their jobs last year because of current economic policy, and talk to those citizens who are without work because of it, he would know the severity of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is Presidential leadership, not rhetoric and excuses about accounting errors.

CONGRESS SEEKS HELP FROM THE PRESIDENT ON TRADE PROBLEMS, NOT JUST INTEREST

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. President, I was concerned in reading the statement made by the President last night. It does seem quite apparent that he seeks to dismiss a very serious problem, the fact that for the first time in 72 years we have become a debtor nation, as some kind of bookkeeping error.

We should welcome the President's newly apparent interest in the trade deficit. We would welcome his help in redressing it. Instead of saying what he is for, however, he seems to content himself with warning against what he calls a "mindless stampede toward protectionism."

None of us wants to engage in protectionism or to start trade wars. However, there is a bill pending, the Gephardt-Bentsen bill, which is not protectionist. It is antiprotectionist. It deserves our support, and that of Mr. Reagan.

This bill provides an effective remedy to discourage foreign protectionism against U.S. exports. That is the kind of legislation on which we need help. It would provide a standby tariff which we hope never would have to be applied. The tariff would be applicable only against those countries which export a disproportionate share into our markets and systematically discriminate against U.S. products in their markets.

We would give any such country due official notice and 1 year of grace, during which time we would ask that they would level the playing field and allow our imports in their markets on exactly the same terms we give theirs. If during that time they did so, no tariff would apply; only if they persisted in face of our entreaties would it apply. That is antiprotectionism.

The President said last night that he asks Congress to work with him, not against him. I am glad he is working

on the problem at all, but I would just turn it around. We in the Congress ask the President to work with us, not against us, as we try to make our own free trade policies truly reciprocal and halt our slide down this "slippery slope" of the loss of American jobs.

BAD ADVICE ON MOZAMBIQUE FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I think we have a great President, but I think he is getting some very bad advice from the State Department.

Tomorrow at the White House President Reagan will visit with Mr. Machel, who is the Communist dictator of Mozambique. In Mozambique there is a bunch of people who are freedom fighters. They are called the Renamo forces. They are doing everything in their power to regain their country in the name of freedom.

Mr. Machel is a Communist dictator who is putting people in dungeons, who is violating all kinds of human rights, and who is deeply in bed with the Soviet Union. He received over \$1 billion in direct military aid from the Soviet Union, and most recently, on August 27, he signed another agreement with the Soviet Union. Yet this House was asked in the foreign aid bill, by the State Department, to give military and economic assistance to Mr. Machel, even though he is tied very closely to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a terrible policy our State Department is asking our President to follow. We should be supporting the Renamo forces, people who are fighting and dying for freedom. They have been doing very, very well. They control about 70 percent of the country right now, and the only areas they do not control are the urban areas. With just a little help from the free world, they could topple that Communist government and put Mozambique back in the free world column. But instead of helping them, we are bringing the Communist dictator to the White House tomorrow. It is a very bad precedent. Those people who have a chance to regain their country should be supported, like our friends, the Contras, are supported in Nicaragua and in Central America. We have a double standard that is being applied here, one that we should change.

Mr. Speaker, the Renamo forces, according to the CIA, have a chance to win, and we should support them.

PRESIDENT'S SELF-SATISFACTION IN AIDS EPIDEMIC TERMED AS INAPPROPRIATE

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, last night in response to a reporter's question, the President for the very first time spoke publicly about the AIDS epidemic. He seemed inappropriately self-satisfied with the role of the administration in funding research efforts to find answers to this dread disease.

The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the funding increases over the past 3 years have resulted solely from congressional action in the face of opposition from the administration.

Mr. President, the AIDS epidemic is exploding all over this country. Thirteen thousand cases have been diagnosed. Half of those people have died. It is beginning to cut across the entire fabric of American society—heterosexuals as well as homosexuals. It is doubling at the rate of once every 10 months. By the end of next year, according to the Office of Technology Assessment of the Congress, there will be 40,000 Americans diagnosed as having AIDS.

Mr. President, this is not the time for self-satisfaction. Now is the time for Presidential leadership for more funds for research, for care and treatment, and for public education.

CRS ISSUES BRIEF ON SEVEN AMERICANS HELD HOSTAGE; 551ST DAY OF CRISIS

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues a new issues brief from the Congressional Research Service concerning the Americans held hostage in Lebanon.

The brief is a thorough and concise record of the circumstances surrounding the kidnaping of seven Americans off the streets of Beirut beginning March 16, 1984, with the seizing of William Buckley, a U.S. Foreign Service officer.

Today marks the 551st day William Buckley has been held hostage in Lebanon.

Rev. Benjamin Weir was kidnaped 498 days ago.

Father Lawrence Jenco has been held hostage for 254 days as of today.

Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut, was kidnaped March 16, 186 days ago.

Today is the 113th day of captivity for David Jacobsen, the director of the American University Hospital.

One hundred days ago today, Thomas Sutherland, dean of the American University Agriculture School was taken hostage.

Today also marks the 288th day since the disappearance of Peter Kilburn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, the hostage crisis in Lebanon is now in its 551st day, 4 months longer than the Iran hostage crisis 5 years ago. If I thought they could hear me, I would cry out: "Hang in there Yanks. We will not forget you not a solitary single one of you. Hang in!"

REVEREND WEIR RELEASED, BUT SIX AMERICANS STILL HELD IN LEBANON

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, we have reports today confirming that the Reverend Benjamin Weir, who has family living in my district, has been freed by his kidnapers in Lebanon.

At this point, the details are sketchy, but I have been told by the Presbyterian Church that Reverend Weir is already in this country, and will appear at a press conference tomorrow.

Reverend Weir has been a captive since May 8, 1984. I know that during that time his family has stood by him, never losing their faith in God, and Ben Weir. I am happy today for Reverend Weir, and for his family.

At the same time, we must not forget that six Americans remain in captivity. Six Americans who should be free. Now that Ben Weir is out, we must redouble our efforts to get the remaining six out of their unwarranted captivity. Our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], has led this effort with determination and I wish to commend and thank him for that leadership.

I send my good wishes to the Weirs; and my prayers and hopes to the other families.

□ 1125

DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the success or failure of our efforts to cut the deficit rests on reconciliation, the enforcement arm of the budget.

The Democratic majority in the House will make or break deficit reduction by what you do with reconciliation. It looks to me like you're going to break it, turn it into cosmetic jewelry with no worth, no value at all.

When we want to cut spending. You want to tinker with it. We want to freeze spending. You want to add to it.

The deficit reduction bill that the Rules Committee walked away from yesterday had to few spending reductions, but it had over \$1 billion in spending increases. You just can't resist pulling out the Government credit card whenever you get the chance, but doing it on a bill called the deficit reduction amendments is a bit too much.

Democrats have been down here in the well day after day slamming the President for not tackling tough issues. Yet what we have in this House is a clear failure to face the most difficult problem before us: Deficit reduction. Let's exercise the jaws a little less and legislate a lot more.

JOY AND SADNESS OVER OUR HOSTAGES IN LEBANON

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I also come to the well today to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, GEORGE O'BRIEN, for the excellent work he has done to keep before us in this Chamber and before the other body and the American people the plight of our seven hostages cruelly imprisoned somewhere in Lebanon. If the call of Reverend Weir's wife to the news media saying that he has finally been released in Lebanon is true, then it is a moment of great joy for his family, but at the same time a painful moment of wrenching sadness for William Buckley's family. Our diplomat Mr. Buckley was taken several months before Benjamin Weir. He has been a hostage now for over a year and a half, 551 days.

As the gentleman from Illinois, GEORGE O'BRIEN, has carefully pointed out to us again and again the exact count of days all of the seven have been held; 551 days for William Buckley stands in vivid comparison to the 444 days that our U.S. Embassy hostages were held in Teheran.

There is substantiated evidence that William Buckley, during the early months of his captivity, was treated quite viciously by his captors. I hope that has changed. I hope they will show mercy to the AP newsman, Terry Anderson, held for 186 days so that Terry can come home and then use his news reporting skills to keep before the world the plight of the other five. He may have no knowledge of them until he is released.

There is the Catholic priest, Father Larry Jenco from Illinois held 254 days. He went to Beirut as the head of the Catholic Relief Services, a good Samaritan as is Benjamin Weir. Rever-

end Weir has given his all or 32 years to minister the men and women and children of all faiths in Lebanon. Peter Kilburn, 288 days of suffering. David Jacobson from my county of Orange 113 days, and Tom Sutherland now 100 days of captivity this day. All three serving at American University when taken by force as hostages.

We appeal as a Congress to the mercy of those in Lebanon who worship the same one God we do, to release our six other hostages so that we can get on with the peace process in the Middle East and so that we can continue the humanitarian aid that we as Americans extend to all people throughout the world.

Again I thank the gentleman from Illinois, GEORGE O'BRIEN, for his leadership.

PERVASIVE DOUBLE STANDARD USED TO JUDGE UNITED STATES POLICY ON NICARAGUA

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me just mention that Mr. David Jacobsen of my district is one of those being held. I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] and others in hoping that those who are holding them will hear our words and heed our request.

Mr. Speaker, we are clearly faced with a threat to our international system; that is the existence of a pervasive double standard that is being used to judge the United States' policy with respect to Nicaragua. Although we have long debated the matter on Nicaragua. I would encourage my colleagues to review the State Department's September 1985 "Revolution Beyond Our Borders." The paper is without question, an excellent reference source.

Contrary to what the opponents have characterized as "President Reagan's misguided crusade to save the world from tiny Nicaragua," the evidence is quite clear that Nicaragua is thoroughly involved in supporting efforts to destabilize Central America. An amendment to the Intelligence Act of 1983, suggests "that activities of the Governments of Cuba and Nicaragua threaten the independence of El Salvador and threaten to destabilize the entire Central America Region and that the Governments of Cuba and Nicaragua refuse to cease those activities." The latter part of the statement even seems to be a plea by the Congress for change by those governments.

The strange notion is that both the United States and Nicaragua and Cuba are playing the same game; that we

are all somehow engaged in trying to alter governments by the use of force and that we are all committing a form of state-sanctioned terrorism. Those who hold out the fallacy that America is the principal problem in Central America are simply denying the permissibility or obligatory right to come to the defense of nations whose peoples are struggling for freedom. Unfortunately, these same critics of U.S. actions will probably never acknowledge the aggression which prompted such a response in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, such criticism is without balanced judgment in understanding what the real threat is to peace and freedom for the people of Central America. United States policy toward Nicaragua must be viewed in the overall Central America context, where we have an interest in the development and preservation of stable societies able to sustain social, economic, and political change.

PRESIDENT REAGAN HAS CHANGED HIS TUNE ON TRADE POLICIES

(Mr. COELHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COELHO. In 1980, when the trade deficit was a whopping \$35 billion, here's what candidate Ronald Reagan had to say about the issue:

For too long our trade policies have been geared toward helping our foreign trading partners. Now we have to put the United States back on the world export map. We helped to pull other countries out of the post-World War Two chaos—it is time to remedy our own crisis. Trade, especially exporting, must be high on the list of our Nation's priorities. The Republicans will put it there to insure the long-term health of the economy.

Wait, there's more—

We should have more free trade but trade must be a two-way street. Free trade should be reciprocal, and we should not be expected to stand idly by while other countries impose barriers to our manufacturers' and farmers' exports.

Mr. Speaker, judging from the President's statements last night, he sure has changed his tune in the last 5 years.

SENSE OF CONGRESS RESOLUTION FOR NEW GATT CONFERENCE

(Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, last night in his press conference, the President stated that he has been pleading with American trading partners for several years to hold a new round of multilateral trade negotiations, known as the GATT talks.

Today I am introducing a sense of the Congress resolution calling on the President to promptly take whatever actions are needed to bring about a new GATT conference. Such a meeting has not taken place since 1979, despite the disastrous state of world trade in recent years.

Before the House and the Senate begin consideration of some possible self-destructive legislation, the President must have the opportunity to try to make corrections in the conference room and not on the trade battlefield. A new GATT conference would not tie the hands of the President to any specific action, but instead permit him to address all different areas of trade at the same time. Presently there are some 300 different pieces of protectionist legislation in the Congress.

By adopting this resolution, we can demonstrate the resolve of Congress for a world trade conference. We can give the President the ammunition he needs to force our own trading partners to come to the bargaining table.

THE PRESIDENT TALKS ABOUT GENEVA

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his candor, at last evening's press conference. I believe he openly shared with us some of his personal thoughts on the upcoming meeting in Geneva with Mr. Gorbachev.

While I hope that progress will be made at the talks, I know that arms control is only one of many issues which divide our two nations. The continuing violation of the human rights of Soviet Jewry is of major concern to our Government. We have differences with the Soviets over chemical warfare matters along with the question of East and West troop levels in Europe.

Who can forget the murder of Major Nicholson and the ongoing incidents directed against United States observers in East Germany?

What can we do about regaining the freedom of the Afghan people?

The activities of Soviet intelligence agents in the United States are of great concern to Americans. Soviet spying efforts in London were widespread enough for the British Government to send a pack of KGB agents back to Moscow.

I would hope that the upcoming talks will be a serious forum for addressing these continuing problems of which arms control is only one of many issues. I hope that the meeting is more than a forum for Mr. Gorbachev to display his public relations skills for the media. As former Foreign Minister Gromyko once said, "Mr. Gorbachev has a nice smile, but iron

teeth." While he may smile a lot, Soviet policy continues to be as aggressive as ever.

I firmly believe that actions speak louder than words. I am looking for a real shift in Soviet attitudes if better relations are to develop.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, 1986

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELLUMS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 12, 1985, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 388) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 388

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, namely:

Sec. 101. (a)(1) Such amounts as may be necessary for projects or activities, not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriation Acts:

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1986;

Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1986;

District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1986;

Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1986;

Department of Housing and Urban Development—Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1986;

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1986; Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1986;

Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1986; and Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, 1986.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House as of October 1, 1985, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1985, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority: *Provided*, That where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses as of October 1, 1985, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1985.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only the House as of October 1, 1985, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the House, at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1985.

(5) No provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act of 1985, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in the joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(6) No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this subsection shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1985.

(b)(1) Such amounts as may be necessary for projects or activities, not otherwise provided for in this joint resolution, which were conducted in the fiscal year 1985, under the current terms and conditions and at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate, for which provision was made in the following appropriation Acts:

Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1985;

Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1985; and

Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1985 and section 101(k) of Public Law 98-473.

(2) No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this subsection shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1985.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing activities, not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, which were conducted in the fiscal year 1985, for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1985, under the current terms and conditions and at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this subsection shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1985 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1985 funds or to initiate, resume or continue any project, activity, operation or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1985: *Provided further*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this subsection shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later: *Provided further*, That the appropriations or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this subsection for procurement of MX missiles shall be in accordance with and subject to all the limitations, restrictions, and conditions set forth in the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (S. 1160) conference agreement and provided for in the conference report (H. Rept. 99-235) filed in the House of Representatives on July 29, 1985.

SEC. 102. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriation Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available from October 1, 1985, and shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) November 14, 1985, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. No provision in any appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1986 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorization or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 102(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without

regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 388) and that I may include extraneous and tabular matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for the purpose of debate only. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, and to the leadership on both sides for their cooperation in letting us bring up this continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution that we bring before you today continues what is essential. It is necessary to continue the orderly operations of the Government into the new fiscal year—which begins October 1, 1985. While this date is 12 calendar days away, there are only 5 legislative days between now and October 1 on which votes have been scheduled in the House.

It is essential that this resolution be passed. As this day nine bills have passed the House, but only two bills have passed the Senate. Given the current situation, it seems unlikely that any regular appropriation bills will be signed into law by October 1.

This is a very straightforward continuing resolution. There are no special provisions and no special funding levels for any programs. The resolution simply carries forward the Government until November 14 or until appropriation bills are enacted.

The philosophy of the resolution before you is as follows:

Provides the lowest reasonable level of interim funding to allow for continued operation of Government programs until final decisions about bills are made.

Is of relatively short duration—6 weeks.

Automatically disengages when regular annual bills are enacted.

Contains no extraneous provisions which more properly should be considered with regular bills.

Under the resolution funding levels are as follows:

For bills which have passed both House and Senate, the funding level for activities is the lower of the two bills. These bills are energy and water development and legislative branch.

For bills which have passed the House only, the funding level for activities is the House bill or the current rate, whichever is lower. These bills include the following:

First, Agriculture; second, Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary; third, District of Columbia; fourth, Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies; fifth, Interior; sixth, Treasury-Postal Service; and seventh, Transportation.

For bills which have not passed the House, the funding level for activities is the current rate. At the present time those bills include the following:

First, foreign assistance which has been reported to the House. Second, military construction which was ordered reported today and will be filed today. Third, Labor, Health and Human Services and Education which has been marked up in subcommittee and is likely to be reported next week. Fourth, defense which is likely to be marked up in subcommittee next week.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for the continuation of the existing provisions of law regarding the prohibition of federally funded abortions and the prohibition against preventing the implementation of programs of voluntary school prayer and meditation in the public schools. These provisions would remain in effect during the duration of the continuing resolution.

Timely enactment of this resolution allows more time to work on the regular annual 1986 appropriations bills. We hope to clear as many of the regular bills as possible during the effective dates of this resolution.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to enter into a brief colloquy with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the continuing resolution extends the so-called Boland amendment, section 8066(a) of Public Law 98-473, is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. The continuing resolution does not specifically address the Contra issue. Its effect is to continue the Boland provision contained in the 1985 defense appropriation bill, just as the other restrictions and limitations in the 1985 Defense Act are continued.

□ 1140

I go further, however, and say the reason we held up the supplemental appropriation bill was trying to give the two sides a chance to agree on language, and it was agreed on.

So the supplemental appropriation bill provided \$27 million for humanitarian assistance to the Contras to remain available for obligation until March 31, 1986, and modified the Boland provision to allow humanitarian assistance and the exchange of intelligence information for the Contras. The funds and the language in the supplemental bill remain in effect. The continuing resolution does not change in any manner the enacted supplemental.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank the chairman. Through the extension of the Boland amendment, accordingly, the House prohibits any new funding, over and beyond that which we specifically made available in the fiscal year 1985 supplemental, except as such money would subsequently specifically be sought by the administration and specifically approved by congressional action. And in essence, what we are saying through the Boland amendment is simply that United States policy with respect to Nicaragua is too important to be funded through any reprogramming or any other avenues except a clear and specific vote by this Congress.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say the purpose of all of this is for a period of 6 weeks. There is no increase involved and no changes other than the modification which I mentioned, which the Congress approved in the supplemental.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank the chairman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the first continuing resolution for fiscal 1986.

The Chairman and the members of the committee are to be commended for presenting the House with the cleanest continuing resolution that I have ever seen.

In the past, we have sometimes based our continuing resolution rates on such questionable standards as reported bills and the President's budget estimates.

There are no such provisions in the resolution before us today.

Accordingly, the resolution has my support, and no objection from the administration.

The resolution continues appropriations for projects and activities until November 14, 1985, or until an appropriation is enacted, whichever occurs first.

Nine appropriation bills for fiscal year 1986 have passed the House: Agriculture, Commerce-Justice-State-Judi-

ciary, District of Columbia, Energy and Water Development, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Legislative, Transportation, and Treasury-Postal Service.

Projects and activities in these bills are continued at rates which are determined by the status of the bill on the first day of the fiscal year.

Where a bill has passed the House and the Senate as of October 1, a project or activity is continued at the lesser amount and under the more restrictive authority.

A project or activity included in only the House or the Senate bill is continued at the rate provided in that bill or the current rate, whichever is lower, and under the current terms and conditions.

No new general provision shall take effect unless it is included in identical form in the House and Senate bills.

Where a bill has passed only the House as of October 1, a project or activity is continued at the House rate or the current rate, whichever is lower, and under the current authority and conditions.

Appropriations are not available to initiate or resume any project or activity not funded in fiscal 1985.

Projects and activities in three of the fiscal year 1985 appropriation bills are continued at the current rate, and under the current terms and conditions. Those bills are: foreign assistance; Labor-HHS-Education; and military construction.

The Labor-HHS rate also includes the following activities for which provision was made in the continuing resolution for fiscal 1985:

Activities under the Public Health Service, Act;

Refugee and entrant assistance activities;

Foster care and adoption assistance activities;

Emergency immigrant education activities; and

Activities under the Follow Through Act.

Projects and activities in the Department of Defense which were conducted in fiscal 1985, and for which provision was made in the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1985, are continued at the current rate and under the current terms and conditions, which include the so-called Boland amendment.

Funds for procurement of MX missiles are subject to all of the limitations, restrictions, and conditions set forth in the 1986 Defense authorization conference agreement and conference report as filed in the House.

No provision which makes a 1986 appropriation contingent upon the enactment of authorizing or other legislation shall be effective during the period covered by the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the resolution, and I can recommend that my colleagues do likewise.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND
RELATED AGENCIES

The fiscal year 1986 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, H.R. 3037, passed the House on July 24. As of today, the other body has not yet taken action on this measure.

In light of this situation, our committee is recommending that the Department of Agriculture and related agencies receive funding after September 30 in accordance with section 101(a) of the continuing resolution. This section provides levels of funding at the current fiscal year 1985 rate, or at the rate provided for in levels contained within the fiscal year 1986 House-passed bill, whichever is lower.

Though we are some \$5 billion below 1985-enacted levels overall in the 1986 bill, in most accounts we are at or slightly over 1985 levels. And so, in general, USDA and its related agencies will receive continued funding at the current rates.

I join the distinguished chairman of our committee in expressing my hope that we will soon see final action on the regular fiscal year 1986 appropriation bill before this joint resolution expires on November 14.

The House has passed the fiscal year 1986 bill, H.R. 2965. The Senate subcommittee has not yet marked up the bill.

Programs are funded at the House-passed level or the current rate, whichever is lower, and under the fiscal year 1985 conditions.

No new programs or new general provisions are allowed.

The House-passed ban on participation in abortion litigation by the Legal Services Corporation is not included. It could be restored to the resolution if the Senate passes the fiscal year 1986 bill with identical language.

All current restrictions on the Legal Services Corporation and the Federal Trade Commission would be continued. The Corporation restrictions include bans on assistance to illegal aliens, participation in class action suits, and lobbying. The resolution would continue 1980 FTC Authorization Act provisions dealing with agricultural cooperatives and marketing orders and trademarks.

CR—DEFENSE

Defense Rate: Same as 1985—\$277.2 billion.

Section 101(c) continues appropriations at the current rate, and under the current terms and conditions, for projects and activities which were conducted in fiscal 1985, and for which provision was made in the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 1985.

Funds for procurement of MX missiles shall be subject to all of the limi-

tations, restrictions, and conditions set forth in the 1986 Defense authorization conference agreement and conference report as filed in the House.

Funds for National Guard and Reserve equipment are available at the current rate until the 1986 Defense Appropriations Act is passed by the House.

Funds for SDI or star wars are at the \$1.4 billion level as against the \$2.7 billion authorized for 1986.

Asat limitations in the 1985 bill remain in force but since no tests are scheduled before the expiration of the continuing resolution, the language becomes moot. The language, however, is in place, and funds are limited to the 1985 level of \$37.4 million rather than the \$200 million requested in 1986 for research and development.

No funds were provided for procurement or facilities for binary gas in 1985 and none would be available under this resolution. The 1985 level for research—\$18.4 million—would be available.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

The energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986 passed the House of Representatives on July 16, and passed the Senate on August 1.

Under the terms of the continuing resolution, programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development measure would continue at the lower of the House-passed or Senate-passed rate.

Neither House has passed the fiscal year 1986 bill.

Programs included in the fiscal year 1985 Foreign Assistance Act are continued at the current rate and under the current terms and conditions.

No new programs or projects are allowed.

Israel will get \$1.2 billion in economic support funds, which will be obligated in its entirety by the end of October under the terms of Public Law 99-83, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985. Foreign military credit sales in the amount of \$1.4 billion for Israel would be apportioned according to the duration of the continuing resolution. Two billion dollars in economic and military assistance to Egypt would also be apportioned.

Current restrictions on population programs and abortion are continued, including restrictions in the Supplemental Appropriations Act [Public Law 99-88]. These include bans on aid to programs involving coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

All country restrictions are continued, including bans on aid to Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Iraq, Libya, Laos, Vietnam, South Yemen, and Syria.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

As my colleagues are aware, the fiscal year 1986 appropriation bill for

the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies, H.R. 3038, passed the House on July 25. As of today, the other body has not yet scheduled floor action on this measure although the Appropriations Committee has completed action on the bill and filed its report 3 weeks ago.

In light of this situation, our committee is recommending that the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 16 independent agencies receive funding after September 30 in accordance with section 101(a) of House Joint Resolution 388. This section provides levels of funding at the current fiscal year 1985 rate or at the rate provided for in the fiscal year 1986 House-passed bill, whichever is lower. And in the \$56.3 billion 1986 bill, I would like to point out that we are below fiscal year 1985-enacted levels in most accounts.

I am hopeful that we will soon see final action on the regular fiscal year 1986 appropriation bill, and that the funding provision for these important agencies will disengage from the continuing resolution before it expires on November 14.

Our committee has taken every possible and responsible action to ensure that the essential programs, projects, and activities at HUD, EPA, NASA, NSF, FEMA, the Veterans' Administration, and each of the independent agencies continue at a reasonable and operable rate until such time as we have reached agreement with the other body and have a separate 1986 bill signed into law by the President.

However, I would like to point out to my colleagues that there are still a number of unresolved programmatic issues on which our committee has deferred funding decisions pending action by the appropriate authorizing committees. These include EPA's Superfund and construction grants programs.

I urge my colleagues on the authorizing committees to join us in taking swift and responsible action to ensure the continuation of these essential environmental activities in fiscal year 1986.

H.J. RES. 388 CONTINUING RESOLUTION, FISCAL
YEAR 1986: INTERIOR SECTION

The Interior appropriations bill passed the House on July 31, 1985. To date, the Senate has taken no action on the bill. The Interior Appropriations Subcommittee could act on the fiscal year 1986 bill this week.

This continuing resolution mandates that programs and activities in the Interior bill will be funded in these 45 days at the fiscal year 1985-enacted level or at the House-passed level; whichever amount is lower.

As far as funding programs in the Interior bill, this continuing resolution is fairly straightforward. However,

there is one general provision carried forward in this continuing resolution that may be of concern to several Members. As provided in the fiscal year 1985 continuing resolution, the ban on leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf off the California coast and Georges Bank in the North Atlantic is continued in force. Based on a preliminary agreement, the House-passed Interior bill did not include the OCS leasing ban.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND
EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, we have not yet considered the fiscal year 1986 Labor/HHS bill here in the House. Therefore, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, this bill provides for all programs at the rate provided for in the fiscal year 1985 Labor/HHS bill, public law 98-619. This continuing resolution also provides at the current rate for several programs carried in last year's continuing resolution: Health planning programs, refugee and entrant assistance, emergency immigrant education, and the Follow Through Program.

Mr. Speaker, this is as clean a continuing resolution as we've ever seen. I want the Members to know that I am sure it is the intention of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER, and it is certainly my own, to bring the Members a separate Labor/HHS bill as soon as possible, and this resolution, that carries us forward into November, in no way affects our ability to make decisions for fiscal year 1986.

LEGISLATIVE

House and Senate have passed fiscal year 1986 bills. Conference not yet scheduled.

House or Senate items contained only in that respective House's version of the fiscal year 1986 bill are continued at the current rate or the rate in the 1986 bill. Whichever is lower, and under the fiscal year 1985 authority and conditions.

Joint items are continued at the lower of the House or Senate 1986 bills, and under the more restrictive authority.

No new programs or projects are allowed.

TRANSPORTATION

The Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986 passed the House of Representatives on September. No action on this measure has yet been taken by the Senate.

Under the terms of the continuing resolution, programs and activities funded in the transportation measure would continue at the lower of the House-passed or current rate, and under such conditions and restrictions as are in effect during fiscal year 1985.

Because in most cases the funding levels contained in the House-passed Transportation appropriations bill for

fiscal year 1986 are the same as, or lower than, the levels enacted for fiscal year 1985, most programs would be continued at the level in the fiscal year 1986 bill. In those few areas where the current rate is lower, such as FAA operations, this continuing resolution will not be in effect a sufficiently long time as to create a problem. In any case, current FAA personnel levels would be maintained.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 388 CONTINUING
RESOLUTION, FISCAL YEAR 1986: TREASURY
SECTION

The Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill passed the House on July 30, 1985, and has been reported by the Senate committee. Action on the floor is expected soon.

This continuing resolution mandates that programs and activities in the Treasury bill will be funded in these 45 days at the fiscal year 1985-enacted level or at the House-passed level; whichever amount is lower.

This formula has an unusual application for the Treasury bill because of actions taken by the House. During markup of the regular fiscal year 1986 bill, the subcommittee did not add back the 5-percent pay cut assumed in the budget estimates. At the time of the markup, the President had not submitted the budget amendment which in effect withdrew the pay cut proposal. Therefore, several programs and activities in this bill will operate on the House-passed levels even though conference action later on is expected to rectify the situation.

However, most law enforcement agencies will not be affected and will operate on the fiscal year 1985-enacted levels with no curtailment of services. Even without the 5-percent salary increase, the Internal Revenue Service, the Customs Service, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms have been allocated higher funding levels in the fiscal year 1986 bill.

As for the general provisions, the bill would carry the standard abortion rider for Federal health benefits and the prohibition against Customs Service closings or consolidation. And pursuant to an agreement reached in the fiscal year 1985 supplemental appropriations bill, the ban on Office of Personnel Management "RIF" regulations will not be in effect.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify a point with the gentleman, if I could.

The limitation that is in the bill with regard to MX missiles that refers to the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1986, now it is my understanding that there are severe problems within the Democratic caucus about getting that bill out here to the floor, and that the reason why we do

not have the authorization enacted is because we have not been able to overcome those problems within the majority caucus.

My question is why was that one section taken out to the exclusion of all others? There were a number of provisions in there. For instance, cleaning up procurement practices at the Department of Defense. Why did we single out only the MX missile portion of the bill and not look at some other provisions in there that may be of equal importance to many of the Members of this body?

Mr. CONTE. That was a very controversial matter, as the gentleman will recall, and it was debated at great length here in the House, and finally an agreement was reached between the House and the other body in the authorization bill. As the gentleman mentioned, we are awaiting action now on that conference report here on the floor.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, my concern is not necessarily as it relates to the continuing resolution, but that we will set a pattern here. If, for example, the majority never does resolve their differences so that we can get that authorization bill to the floor, I am not certain that I am wholly comfortable with having had this one provision singled out, and maybe set a precedent that that is the only thing from the defense authorization that we are going to deal with in the appropriation process at a later date.

Is that a valid concern, or are we, in fact, going to go through a scenario of having appropriation bills at a later date which, in fact, will not follow the authorization of the House?

Mr. CONTE. I hope not. But the provision does support the position of the House. There has been precedent for such provisions in the past.

The continuing resolution is only for 45 days, and hopefully within that time the defense appropriation bill will be on the floor of the House.

We have had a problem in that the chairman of that subcommittee has been very ill, and hopefully he will be back by then and we will be acting.

But I hope that authorization conference report will pass.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say my problem is with the authorization process, because I think we do have a conference report. It seems to me that the House should act on that conference report.

The fact is that as a result of a disagreement within the majority caucus, we have been unable to act upon that authorization report. I am somewhat concerned about the fact that we are now going to single out pieces of it and begin to bring those out as a part of the appropriation process, not having had an opportunity to deal with the

authorization conference report that I think should have been brought to the floor several weeks ago.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. My colleague, Mr. CONTE, is absolutely correct. We try to honor agreements that have been reached already by the Congress in the supplemental bill and in certain other actions of Congress. The current rate for the MX is much higher than agreed upon in the authorization conference on the MX, and we have followed that action by holding the procurement of MX missiles to 12 in fiscal year 1986. It is my understanding this is presently agreeable to the administration.

In this we try to accede to the places where the Congress has acted.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have just one question.

In California right now, we have a rather controversial question of offshore drilling. Some of us have always opposed moratoria and have, in fact, opposed the tentative agreement that was reached between the Secretary and some Members of our delegation prior to the time that the Secretary then discovered that he could not continue to support it.

It is my understanding that this 45-day continuing resolution continues the moratoria language that was contained in the last year's continuing resolution which in effect means that it only will be in law unless further action is taken for another 45 days.

It is also further my understanding that the Department of Interior has no intention of attempting to go out to lease on any of these tracts, and cannot because of previous legislation for a period extending past the 45 days.

Can the gentleman tell me whether my statement is correct as far as he understands it?

Mr. CONTE. Yes, I think the gentleman from California is correct.

If the Interior bill has only passed the House as of October 1, then the moratorium in current law would be extended until November 14.

If the bill has passed the House and the Senate as of October 1, then current law no longer applies, and the terms and conditions are the more restrictive provision in the House or Senate bill.

However, no new general provisions in the House or Senate bills shall take effect unless they are in identical form in both bills.

Mr. LUNGREN. I understand that, and I would just like to say for the record that some of us who have never supported the moratorium in the past, if we do not object to this bill or vote against it do not want to be interpreted as supporting a moratorium for the first time. We understand the decisions that your committee had to go through in trying to keep this as clean a bill as possible, and the best way to do that was to extend current law.

So I would like to congratulate the committee for as clean a bill as I think I have seen around here. I know that the gentleman shares with me the sad feeling that this is not the way we ought to do legislation around here. The gentleman has commented on that many times and the chairman has commented on that many times. It seems unfortunately that continuing resolutions are becoming the rule rather than the exception, and I hope that at some point in time the Congress can get its act together and not go through this episode on a 45-day schedule or a biyearly schedule.

But I understand the bind the committee is in and I appreciate the gentleman for at least outlining what the situation is with respect to that provision in the Interior section of the bill.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank the gentleman.

I might say, if there are no further speakers, if this passes right now we may go down in the "Guinness Book of Records" for the shortest period of time in passing a continuing resolution.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, however neutral this continuing resolution is intended to be, or said to be, it is, by its nature, deserving of a negative note.

Continuing resolutions are nothing but a copout. They are required because we didn't do our job, as required by law, in the time allowed. In addition, even in the unlikely event that they contain no new boondoggles, nor new Members' pet but unwarranted projects, they preserve all the old boondoggles and old Members' pet, but unwarranted, projects.

It is also true that this resolution accepts provisions of appropriations bills that have passed the House, but have not been enacted, which not only shatter the President's budget, and the limits of good sense, but also exceed the House's own budget when supplemental appropriations are figured.

In all respects, House Joint Resolution 388 deserves a resounding "no" vote.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1986 (H.J. Res. 388), which we are considering today is for 6 weeks and terminates on November 14, 1985. There are departments, agencies and programs under the sections of the resolution that I am responsible for (the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies) that will be held to a lower level of funding than is advisable and that most

Members of the House and Senate would want for fiscal year 1986. Although it would be better if these departments and agencies knew exactly how much money they will have, it was not possible to go through each of these programs one at a time. Also the levels of funding might be changed as a result of negotiations with the administration. However, the continuing resolution is for only a 6 weeks period and hopefully before it expires, there will be final action on the fiscal year 1986 Appropriations Bill for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies (H.R. 2965) that will eject those programs from the resolution. H.R. 2965 passed the House July 17 and is pending in the Senate. Hopefully the Senate will consider the bill and pass it soon and thus remedy the whole situation.

One such problem area is the Legal Services Corporation where the level of funding under all bills is the same as last year's level. This situation leaves no room for cost of living increases for personnel or inflation increases for individual programs. That means that there will not be such increases or that there must be reductions in other areas of the Legal Services Program. There is a considerable difference of opinion as to how this problem should be handled. The best remedy would be for the House and Senate to pass an authorization for the Legal Services Corporation for fiscal year 1986 which would deal with these kinds of questions. The last authorization for appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation expired at the end of fiscal year 1980, and enactment of a new authorization would be a way for all Members of the House and Senate to express their views on this and other matters. Although the administration is opposed to any federally funded legal services program, at least we would know how a majority of the House and Senate feel about the components and priorities of the whole program even if such a bill is vetoed. However, since action on such a bill appears to be uncertain at this time, it would be advisable that Congress proceed with the regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986 as fast as possible to settle this matter and that the Legal Services Corporation take no action until we have had an opportunity to deal with this issue in a definitive manner.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 156, not voting 6, as follows:

(Roll No. 308)

YEAS—272

Ackerman	Fish	McCurdy
Akaka	Flippo	McDade
Alexander	Florio	McHugh
Anderson	Foglietta	McKinney
Andrews	Foley	Meyers
Annunzio	Ford (MI)	Mica
Anthony	Ford (TN)	Mikulski
Applegate	Fowler	Miller (CA)
Aspin	Frank	Miller (OH)
Atkins	Frost	Mineta
AuCoin	Fuqua	Mitchell
Barnes	Garcia	Moakley
Bateman	Gaydos	Molinari
Bedell	Gedjenson	Mollohan
Beilenson	Gephardt	Montgomery
Bennett	Gibbons	Moody
Berman	Gilman	Moore
Blaggi	Gonzalez	Morrison (CT)
Bliley	Goodling	Morrison (WA)
Boehlert	Gordon	Mrazek
Boggs	Gradison	Murtha
Boland	Gray (IL)	Myers
Boner (TN)	Gray (PA)	Natcher
Bonior (MI)	Green	Neal
Bonker	Guarini	Nelson
Borski	Hall (OH)	Nichols
Bosco	Hamilton	Nowak
Boucher	Hammerschmidt	O'Brien
Boxer	Hatcher	Oakar
Breaux	Hawkins	Oberstar
Brooks	Hayes	Obey
Broomfield	Hefner	Olin
Brown (CA)	Hefel	Ortiz
Bryant	Hillis	Owens
Burton (CA)	Horton	Panetta
Bustamante	Howard	Parris
Carper	Hoyer	Pashayan
Carr	Huckaby	Pease
Chandler	Hutto	Pepper
Chappell	Jeffords	Perkins
Clay	Jenkins	Pickle
Clinger	Johnson	Price
Coelho	Jones (NC)	Pursell
Coleman (TX)	Jones (OK)	Quillen
Collins	Jones (TN)	Rahall
Conte	Kanjorski	Ray
Conyers	Kaptur	Regula
Cooper	Kennelly	Reid
Coughlin	Kildee	Richardson
Coyne	Klaczka	Ridge
Crockett	Kolter	Rinaldo
Daniel	Kostmayer	Rodino
Darden	LaFalce	Roe
Daschle	Lantos	Rogers
Davis	Lehman (CA)	Rose
Dellums	Lehman (FL)	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Leland	Roukema
Dicks	Levin (MI)	Rowland (GA)
Dingell	Levine (CA)	Roybal
DioGuardi	Lewis (CA)	Rudd
Dixon	Lipinski	Sabo
Donnelly	Livingston	Savage
Dowdy	Lloyd	Schneider
Downey	Lowery (CA)	Schumer
Duncan	Lowry (WA)	Seiberling
Durbin	Lujan	Sharp
Dwyer	Lundine	Siljander
Dymally	MacKay	Sisisky
Dyson	Manton	Skeen
Early	Markley	Skelton
Edgar	Marlenee	Slattery
Edwards (CA)	Martin (NY)	Smith (FL)
Emerson	Martinez	Smith (IA)
Erdreich	Matsui	Smith (NE)
Evans (IL)	Mavroules	Smith (NJ)
Fascell	Mazzoli	Solarz
Fazio	McCloskey	Spratt

St Germain
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Tallon
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns

Trafigant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst

Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NAYS—156

Archer	Glickman	Oxley
Armey	Gregg	Packard
Badham	Groberg	Penny
Barnard	Gunderson	Petri
Bartlett	Hall, Ralph	Porter
Barton	Hansen	Ritter
Bates	Hartnett	Roberts
Bentley	Hendon	Roemer
Bereuter	Henry	Roth
Bilirakis	Hertel	Rowland (CT)
Boulter	Hiler	Russo
Brown (CO)	Holt	Saxton
Broyhill	Hopkins	Schaefer
Bruce	Hubbard	Scheuer
Burton (IN)	Hughes	Schroeder
Byron	Hunter	Schuetter
Callahan	Hyde	Schulze
Campbell	Ireland	Sensenbrenner
Carney	Jacobs	Shaw
Chapman	Kasich	Shelby
Chappie	Kastenmeier	Shumway
Cheney	Kemp	Shuster
Coats	Kindness	Sikorski
Cobey	Kolbe	Slaughter
Coble	Kramer	Smith (NH)
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Smith, Denny
Combust	Latta	Smith, Robert
Courter	Leach (IA)	Snowe
Craig	Leath (TX)	Snyder
Crane	Lent	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Daub	Lightfoot	Staggers
DeLay	Loeffler	Stallings
DeWine	Lott	Stenholm
Dickinson	Luken	Strang
Dorgan (ND)	Lungren	Stump
Dornan (CA)	Mack	Sweeney
Dreier	Madigan	Swindall
Eckart (OH)	Martin (IL)	Synar
Eckert (NY)	McCain	Tauke
Edwards (OK)	McCandless	Tauzin
English	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Evans (IA)	McEwen	Vucanovich
Fawell	McGrath	Walker
Feighan	McKernan	Weaver
Fiedler	McMillan	Weber
Fields	Michel	Whittaker
Franklin	Miller (WA)	Wirth
Frenzel	Monson	Wyden
Gallo	Moorhead	Wyllie
Gekas	Murphy	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Nielson	Zschau

NOT VOTING—6

Addabbo	de la Garza	Rangel
Bevill	Long	Robinson

□ 1210

Messrs. RUSSO, DEWINE, DORGAN of North Dakota, FRANKLIN, OXLEY, and KEMP changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MARKEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to death in the family, I was

absent for the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "aye" on rollcall No. 297; "no" on rollcall No. 298; "no" on rollcall No. 299; "aye" on rollcall No. 300; "aye" on rollcall No. 301; "aye" on rollcall No. 302; "no" on rollcall No. 304; "aye" on rollcall No. 305; "no" on rollcall No. 307.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 262 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 1215

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, with Mr. SLATTERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 12, 1985, section 4 was open to amendment at any point.

Are there any further amendments to section 4 of H.R. 7?

The Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF WHOLE MILK AS A SCHOOL LUNCH BEVERAGE

Section 9(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: "In addition to such other forms of milk as the Secretary may determine, such lunches shall offer whole milk as a beverage."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

The Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. ELIMINATION OF REFERENCE TO FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS.

Section 9(b)(1)(A) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) by striking out in the second sentence "For the school years ending June 30, 1982, and June 30, 1983, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The"; and

(2) by striking out the third sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

The Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. AUTOMATIC ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN PROGRAMS

Section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) Any child who is a member of a household under the food stamp program or a member of an AFDC assistance unit (under the aid to families with dependent children program under part A of title IV of

the Social Security Act), in a State where the standard of eligibility for such assistance does not exceed 130 per centum of the income poverty guidelines, shall be served a free lunch and breakfast without further application or eligibility determinations. For the purposes of any verification under paragraph (2)(C), proof of receipt of food stamps or AFDC shall be sufficient."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

The Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON MEAL CONTRACTING.

Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) A school or school food authority participating in a program under this Act may not contract with a food service company to provide a la carte food service unless such company agrees to offer free, reduced-price, and full-price reimbursable meals to all eligible children."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 5, after line 22, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 9. ELIMINATION OF 1986 ADJUSTMENT TO REIMBURSEMENT RATES IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended in paragraph (3)(A) by striking out "July 1, 1982" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1987".

(b) CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM.—Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(3)(A) by striking out "July 1 of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1987 and each subsequent July 1"; and

(2) in subsection (f)(3)(B), by striking out "July 1 of each year" and inserting "July 1, 1987 and each subsequent July 1".

(c) SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN.—Section 13(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking out "each January 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "on January 1, 1987 and each subsequent January 1"; and

(2) by inserting at the end of paragraph (4)(B) the following sentence: "Such rates should not be adjusted to reflect changes in costs or prices during the period January 1, 1985 through January 1, 1986."

(d) SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—Section 4(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof as follows: "No such annual adjustment shall be made July 1, 1986."

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have not been furnished with copies of the amendment on this side. I request that we be provided with this amendment and the ones which follow. Otherwise, we would have to object to taking them up without reading them.

Will the gentleman comply with that request, please?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe that the committee chairman has received a copy. It is entitled, "COLA Freeze." I do apologize to the chairman. We had provided copies of all of these amendments last week. I think both the majority and the minority of the committee had expected this bill not to come up until later today or tomorrow, and so I would inquire of the chairman of the committee as to whether he now has a copy of the amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. We have received copies, and I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, let me first put this amendment in the context of H.R. 7 and of the entirety of the school lunch programs. Last week during the debate, the House I think began to understand that a combination of the changes in H.R. 7 and these programs plus current law would cause the entirety of the national school lunch programs and the other programs that are amended by H.R. 7, would cause these entitlement programs to increase over the next 5 years beginning in fiscal year 1986 at the rate of approximately 6 to 7 percent a year.

Now, that 6 to 7 percent a year assumes the same number of recipients. So if the number of recipients were to increase, the increases would be greater.

Mr. Chairman, the result of that is that at the end of 5 years, if the House passes H.R. 7 today, and makes none of the modifications that will be proposed in this amendment and others, the result of that will be at the end of 5 years an unintended, I think, 36-percent increase of some \$2 billion.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the first entitlement program that I can recall this House has considered this session, either to amend or to reauthorize.

□ 1220

The largest entitlement program in this section, the National School Lunch Program, is a permanently authorized program and, therefore, it is very seldom the House gets an opportunity to examine that program and

determine if there are some ways to improve it so as to limit the rate of increases.

Mr. Chairman, the entitlement programs in the aggregate, as this House so well knows, are the single largest cause of the increases in the Federal deficit, constituting some 52 percent of Federal spending, and I think the House would prefer to deal with all of the entitlement programs in the aggregate, but that is not one of our options. All we can do today is to consider this program and then to hope that in many ways, as it will, modifications in this entitlement program will lead to modifications in others.

Mr. Chairman, in the context of this amendment, even if combined with all the other amendments, this amendment will not reduce spending at all. It will not reduce payments, it will not reduce spending. This amendment is a 1-year freeze on the automatic COLA's that otherwise would go into effect on July 1, 1986. Nor does this amendment eliminate COLA's. It only provides for a 1-year freeze or a respite from those COLA's that have increased the cost of these programs year after year.

Mr. Chairman, this would not lower expenditures. It would merely lower the rate of increases.

Now, school meal costs or reimbursements have been increased every year on July 1, at a calculated rate based on various indices. Between 1979 and 1983, school meal costs actually rose 7 percent, but the Consumer Price Index adjustment for the COLA was increased 32 percent. Between 1979 and 1983, total subsidies for free meals, if you include the producer's index and the commodity index, total subsidies increased 21 percent, but the cost only increased 7 percent.

So in many ways, Mr. Chairman, this change, this 1-year COLA freeze, a modest proposal, would really allow only a 1-year catch-up of some of the increases in cost.

These COLA's do not apply specifically to the students or to the recipients themselves but they are institutional programs, institutional reimbursements that are made to the school district. All that we are saying in this COLA freeze for 1 year is that for 1 year the Government would recoup some of the overreimbursement that has been made in past years.

Let me repeat the numbers again. A 21-percent average increase in the reimbursements, versus a 7-percent increase in cost between 1979 and 1983. This amendment would not recoup those costs but would merely provide for a 1-year freeze.

Now, it is too early to—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bar the adjustment for inflation which is made in the reimbursement rates for the child nutrition programs. It would amount to a cut of \$38 million in funding for fiscal year 1986, \$250 million for fiscal year 1987, and \$273 million for fiscal 1988.

May I, first, place the amendment in focus with respect to the overall budget problem?

H.R. 7 only attempts to reauthorize five expiring programs. It does not include all of the programs indicated by the gentleman from Texas on his now famous chart, which I think gives a false impression, an impression of busting the budget.

Unfortunately, this does not attempt to do that. We have scaled it down twice before this, in previous sessions, in 1983 and again in 1984. We have constantly reduced the amount for these programs. And the current proposal again reduces the amount.

After having documented the need for this program before the Budget Committee, the Budget Committee has indicated to us that H.R. 7 is completely within the limits of the Budget Committee and also the budget conference report, as reported by both the House and the Senate. So we are not doing anything fantastic. We are simply complying with the budget resolution as to the amounts.

Now, as to the merit of the amendment itself, 87 percent of the funds for child nutrition is earmarked to provide meals for poor children; therefore, the burden of this amendment is not on those who come from wealthy families but on the poor and the most needy among the children of this Nation.

These programs, despite what has been said, have already been cut. They were cut by one-third in 1981 and since that time, for a cumulative total of over \$5 billion over this period of time. Now, that is a very disproportionate amount. No other program has been cut as much.

So with this amendment the gentleman is again picking upon a program that has constantly been cut since 1981. If that is a contribution to budget deficit reduction, this program has already suffered I think disproportionately more than any other.

The gentleman from Texas seems to be inconsistent in his desire to reduce the deficit. He has himself supported as much as \$10 billion increase, in defense, in spite of busting the limits of the budget resolution in that instance, and in this instance he has a great fidelity for reducing the deficit. That inconsistency, it seems to me, is unwarranted in this instance.

There is a practical situation involved, as well, in the amendment. The school year has already begun. Contracts have been signed. Cafeteria

workers have been hired on the basis of existing contracts. Food suppliers have already been contracted with, on the basis of the continuation of the current law, making allowance for the inflation factor.

This amendment would upset these contracts. It would simply mean that before the school year has been completed, they would have to take recognition of the fact that they have not made adjustments for inflation and try to readjust those contracts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, just briefly, however.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and not for the purpose of debating our differences but to clarify that this amendment does not affect the current school year. It would affect the COLA scheduled for July 1, 1986. So it would take effect in the 1986-87 school year, and school districts would then have almost a full 12-month notice that there would not be that increase built into their budget. I wanted the gentleman to understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] has expired.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was here and heard the gentleman offer his amendment. We serve together on the Education and Labor Committee and I know of his deep concern for education. We have our differences. But I never thought we would have a difference in this area. I respect and share the gentleman's concern for education. The subject of this proposal is child nutrition. We as a nation are concerned with nutrition of people all over the world, and have responded in generous fashion—and properly so. However, when it comes to dealing with the young folks of our own country, we sometimes find a penurious attitude, as reflected in this amendment.

Clearly this amendment would only exacerbate an already diminished situation. We have lost some \$5 billion to date since 1981. This amendment would only further the cuts and reduce the program.

We look at the young folks today, and we know that the nutrition program is working and so we witness their nutrition improving. An see it in their well being. It is this very effort by our country over the years that has helped develop a better mind and body for our young folks.

The gentleman argues—and I understand his concern—the budget deficit which is clearly an important concern to all of us. If we are to cut, certainly do not pick on a nutrition program for the children. It is a miserly attitude. It

is something that should be rejected out of hand. The argument cannot be made that the budget resolution is constrictive. The fact is, the budget resolution permits adjustments for inflation.

The gentleman, if he is concerned about budget deficits should look to the time he voted for \$10 billion more for defense. And I have no quarrel with defense expenditures, but here we are, in the process of emasculating a program that has served our Nation well and has kind of taken the sting out of the pocket of poverty that existed in our Nation over the years.

I am not saying that every program functions in perfection. But no program in Government operates in perfect fashion. Let us not, as a matter of policy, cut in a cruel fashion the way this amendment suggests. We should not be cutting. We should be increasing. And I sincerely hope and pray that the Members of this august body will reject the gentleman's amendment, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman would, upon reflection, recognize the error of his ways and perhaps withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a strange thing happened on the way to something. I am not sure what it was. But when we started this year, there was a great deal of talk in the Congress that, as a matter of fact, the least we were going to do was freeze across the board; and then we were going to go beyond that. So in my first service on the Budget Committee, we passed a budget on the House side, which did not do that at all. The Senate passed a budget that did not do that at all. And then they got together in conference, and that was the most amazing thing I have ever seen, because in conference the President got what he wanted, no new taxes, no freeze on Social Security, the House got what they wanted, increases in domestics, the Senate got what they wanted, increases in defense, and they came back and told us:

We are not only going to save as much as we said we were when it left the Budget Committee originally but, as a matter of fact, we are going to save more, even though all three sides got what they wanted.

That is an amazing thing.

Well, at that time I suggested some things, including what is being offered now, to the Budget Committee and the Finance Committee, that if you are truly going to freeze the entire budget, I want you to know the areas where you will be least devastating in the nutrition area. But as I indicated, they did not decide to do that at all. As a matter of fact, they said some areas get COLA's, they said you must have COLA's in defense, you must have 3 percent in the out years, and so

forth. So now we are saying defense and everything else can have increases, but when it comes to cost-of-living increases for nutrition programs, the answer is "no," you take a freeze.

I am not here to defend that kind of budgeting. I would not want to go out and tell the public that somehow or other I voted for a budget that increased in many areas but in one of the most important areas, which is nutrition, we decided a freeze would be all right.

Well, let us look at the COLA situation in relationship to what we have done in the last several years. Every COLA that has been given, every program that has a COLA, you can make the same argument that the gentleman from Texas has made now. You can do that in Social Security. You can say it far outstripped what we gave in relationship to what the figures should have been. But look at it in this context: With the reconciliation of 1981, the Child Nutrition Program, which represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget, took 4 percent of the cut. One-half of 1 percent of the entire budget took 4 percent of the total cut. In short, the nutrition program enacted in 1981 was approximately 10 times greater in cuts than an across-the-board freeze.

□ 1235

So do not look at what may have happened as far as COLA's are concerned; put it in the proper context, and look what has happened in reductions that took place in the whole nutrition program. Then you will discover as a matter of fact that you are spending less than what those so-called inflated COLA's would have given you.

Second, if you make this cut, and I am assuming it is across-the-board, except milk; I say that for the dairy producers—if you make this cut and you are talking about a school breakfast program, and you are talking about a summer feeding program, who makes that up? You are not talking about some school district that may go out and increase taxes, et cetera. You are talking about some programs that are carried on differently.

Let me just wind it up by indicating that the inflation adjustment will be in the range of 4 to 5 percent we are told in 1986. Again, keep in mind in 1981, even though it represented one-half of 1 percent of the total budget, nutrition took 4 percent of the cuts.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address the suggestion so often raised

among some of our colleagues that no one goes hungry in America.

About a week ago, coincidentally, on the same day this bill was scheduled for consideration. I was going to the place where I live here in Washington, five blocks from the Capitol, about 9 o'clock. There was a little child who lives two doors from me named Tony. He was crying. I approached him, asked how he was doing, and he told me that earlier in the day someone jumped him in his words, beat him up, and stolen his bicycle.

I was trying to comfort him in neighborly terms, during which time I learned that he was hungry. I asked Tony when he ate last, and he said yesterday at noon. I learned that his last meal he had was the day before at school, and that he had not eaten on this particular day because he had missed because his bicycle had been stolen.

There are many children today, maybe even thousands within the shadow of this Capitol where we sit in comfort during the debate on this bill, who only get one meal a day and it is provided to them at school by the program that we are debating this day. I expect that that figure is multiplied thousands of times across our land in numerous situations in every town in America.

Some of the people who are crying loudest about the budget have concern about the budget as all of us do who are here debating it. But we should not lose sight of the fact that in this great land where we are debating a budget of almost \$900 billion that we should not lose sight of the fact that many of our citizens; namely, young children, only get one balanced meal a day which is provided to them by the School Lunch Program through the school that they attend. I urge all of my colleagues to take this fact into consideration and not lose sight of the fact that while we must attend and give consideration to the needs of the budget, that we should also give consideration to the needs of our citizens.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the hungry and needy schoolchildren in this country are not the real cause of the deficits. Very often when we come to programs for the needy we raise the specter of the deficit. Now, I recognize that consistency is not a strong virtue in this House, but it is something that we should strive for, at least. A certain sensitive consistency.

I have enormous respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT]. He and I worked together last year on a bill that no one said could pass. We worked well together on that, and I appreciate that work. But as all of us at times are inconsistent, so can he be. Just on June 18 of this year, he voted

for \$10 billion extra for the Defense Department; really beyond that which the budget resolution called for. He was not for a freeze there.

I recognize that he feels defense is a very high priority, but Mr. Weinberger's extra dollars in the last 5 years did not come from revenue, they came from filching dollars from other programs. They came from filching dollars from schoolchildren, from pregnant women, and from the poor. That is where he got the dollars. I can figure that. There is no extra revenue; he had to get the money from other programs. That is where he got those dollars. By supporting an amendment like this, we are telling him, "Here is our blessing on that; get some more of your dollars from this program." That is where the dollars will go; we know that. That is the record of the last 5 years.

In real life I was a schoolteacher. I taught school, and I can recall one incident in my life that really made me a strong supporter of this program. I was raised in a family where stealing was considered a very, very terrible offense. I found out that in my home room there in high school that my students were having their lunches stolen. Every day someone's lunch was being stolen, and that really outraged my sense of justice. So I really went to work on that and I found the culprit. I nailed the culprit. I called him in. And while his stealing was wrong, let me tell you this: He never got a breakfast in the morning. His first task when he came to school in the morning was to get something to eat. But he had a certain honor. He said, "Mr. Kildee, I never steal from the same person in the same week."

Do not take this food away from kids. For gosh sake, there are other ways to save money.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to support any amendments that affect the child nutrition programs. But I am compelled to come to the floor in support of this amendment because I believe it is imperative that we only provide increases in spending in those areas where we have strong need to do so.

I think that the opponents of this amendment have made some good points. But they have also been guilty of using some very faulty arguments in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. What we have done on defense may or may not be relevant, but it does appear to me that it is misleading and wrong for those who are arguing in opposition to this amendment to solely base the argument on the assertion that if we do not spend the money for this, we will spend it for defense. You voted for an increase for defense, they say, and

now we ought to vote for an increase for this. I did not vote for any increase for defense, and I do not think I have voted for an increase for any program this year. But whether or not the rest of my colleagues have voted for an increase in those programs is not particularly relevant here. What is relevant is this: When we do not have any money in the Treasury, can we justify increases in this program? Will the program fail in its mission if we do not provide more money?

I have heard nobody in opposition to this amendment stand up and explain why we have to have a cost-of-living adjustment in this program in order to maintain the program, provide food for starving children, provide food for children who are not starving but maybe want a lunch. Nobody has bothered to do that.

Nor have they bothered to look at what has happened to the program during the past several years.

□ 1245

In fact, what has happened is that we have given cost-of-living adjustments in this program that have far exceeded the cost of food purchased for the program. The cost of meals under this program have increased very slightly. Between 1979 and 1983, for example, there was a 7-percent increase in the cost of providing a meal, while the index under which this program got increases went up 21 percent.

So we have increased the money for the program far faster than the cost of food has gone up. If one looks at what has happened during the last year, and if one projects what is going to happen for the next year, the cost of food is not going up, ladies and gentlemen, the cost of food is going down.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman also tell me that the cost of equipment is going down, not up, and the cost of labor is going down, not up?

Mr. TAUKE. I would be happy to respond to the gentleman.

First, we are not talking about equipment in this particular portion of the program.

Mr. GOODLING. We are talking about cost-of-living increases.

Mr. TAUKE. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

The second point that I am trying to make is that we have here limited dollars. Of course, I would love and I am sure the gentleman would love to not just give a cost-of-living adjustment for the program but to double it, give everybody free meals. But the point is that we have limited dollars within which to work.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. No, I will not.

We have limited dollars within which to work, and when we have limited dollars within which to work, we have to make tough decisions. There has not been any case made for increasing the expenditures, except to say that if we do not increase the expenditures, we are going to be taking food from starving children. Not true.

The fact is that the program will be maintained.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's response because no matter how you slice it, the fact is that it is between those years of 1979 to 1983, which is the last time for which we have the figures, total school meal costs have only increased 7 percent, but the reimbursement by the Federal Government to the school districts in institutional entitlement has been increased by 21 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BARTLETT and by unanimous consent, Mr. TAUKE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to emasculate the program or even reduce the program, but only reduce the rate of increase. This amendment would still permit a rate of increase, with a 1-year breather for the COLA, not even to catch up completely to that disparity, but just a 1-year breather.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman for his point.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa. He has put his finger right on the basic issue that we are talking about, the discipline of the House. If we are going to begin to increase this program, housing, Customs, IRS collectors, water projects, defense then increased and spendings continue to dominate this House. We are losing our discipline in respect to the deficit. We as a nation are borrowing 20 percent of our revenue. Our general fund will pay out

\$130 billion on the interest alone in 1986 on the national debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. PURSELL and by unanimous consent, Mr. TAUKE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that yes, it is a great program. I have been a former teacher and I have been on the Committee on Education and Labor, and I can name a hundred great programs and so could you and so could all of us. We have 435 Members here. But if discipline breaks down here, I think what it's suggesting is that all bets are off on the Defense bill, which is yet to come. When that Defense bill comes up, what are we going to do? Are we going to allow the \$10 billion increase in defense over 1985? We must be consistent and say "no" to increased spending.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I am never quite sure whether we are in the House of Representatives or in an Alice-in-Wonderland situation. We are operating under a budget resolution which provides exactly for the growth that is involved here. That is the budget resolution. We either stand by that budget resolution or we do not. We cannot pick and choose and say, "Oh, in this area I am going to support the budget resolution, and in this area I am not."

This bill meets the budget resolution, period. Now, we either stand with that or we do not.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to support the budget resolution because we are only talking about \$39 billion savings in the budget.

We are talking about a freeze at 1985 levels. That is a different figure than the House budget resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is all that crystal clear that there is some page of the budget resolution that contemplates an increase in these programs at the rate that they are being increased. In fact, there is no such one single page. The fact of the matter is that the budget resolution in many ways becomes very, very vague, as it does in this area.

The fact is that there is nothing in the budget resolution which would suggest that we control these costs. Nowhere, when the budget was voted on, and I do not support that budget either, did anyone say, "That means a 36-percent increase in the cost of these programs." I do not believe there is a Member of this House who believes that.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman for his point.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by saying, ladies and gentlemen, that regardless of what we do in other programs, when we look at this program, we must apply rigorous standards, as we do to every program, and say, "Is it absolutely necessary to have increases in spending?"

In view of the fact that we have more than overcompensated for increases in food costs in the immediate past, in view of the fact that food costs are going down, and in view of the fact that we have heard nothing suggesting that the removal of the cost-of-living adjustment for 1 year would in any way stymie this program, I think we should accept the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the particular amendment that is being offered today on the House floor for a variety of reasons.

First of all, I have to say that when we are talking about spending money of any sort on the Federal level, we are obviously dealing with prioritization, of how important an individual issue to an individual Member. It so happens that in my particular case the priority of feeding children and giving them a decent meal so that they do not go hungry is pretty high up there.

What are we talking about in terms of the specifics of the legislation? We are talking about 87 percent of the money that we are voting on going to poor, to hungry children, to children that I go up and down the hollows and see go around a lot of times in rag tails, without a decent meal except what they get when they go to school. This is the kind of thing we are talking about.

What are we talking about when we deal with where the cuts are going to come from? The distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I know, has a great concern on this issue. What we are talking about is cutting one of two

things. We are talking about cutting either the number of people who are getting the food, or the quality of the food.

All right. If those are the two things that we are talking about cutting, in what type of situation are we? What type of situation are we in to cut?

In 1981, one-third of this program was cut out in that particular type of legislation we had back then. We absorbed a heavy cut at that particular time period. Now they talk about how much increase these programs have gotten.

I ask the distinguished gentleman if he would please take a look and see that, in fact, this legislation ties the price of food. If the price of food goes up, then the COLA goes up. So when we talk about a 21-percent increase over the past several years that we have had, if it has gone up by 21 percent it is because the food has gone by 21 percent.

□ 1255

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I have asked him to yield not for the purpose of debate but for clarification.

In fact, the COLA under this program is adjusted according to the CPI, not according to the cost of food. The difficulty with this is that the meal costs have gone up only slightly, but the CPI has gone up a dramatic amount, and thus we have the disparity.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have just a further point for clarification. It is my understanding that it is the CPI based upon how you provide food costs away from home; is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. That includes restaurants, both expensive and inexpensive. It is the CPI, under the food-away-from-home, that is the adjustment. That has increased by 32 percent for those years, and the reimbursement under this program has increased by 21 percent. But school meal cost have only increased 7 percent in that time. That is the disparity we are discussing.

I am not seeking to recapture that entire disparity but only to provide for a 1-year freeze or a 1-year breather to perhaps recapture 3 percent or 3½ or perhaps some much smaller amount than that.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say that it

is my understanding that it is a weighted balance from the variety of the different away-from-home costs, so it is not just restaurant costs. And what we are talking about here is in fact a program that is tied with this away-from-home cost to the price of that away-from-home food. That is all it is, purely and simply.

What are we talking about in these terms? When you are away from home, what is it going to cost you if you are going to get some sort of meal? What we say here is that we are providing at that particular price, the most lean price that we can get in essence, some sort of increase to keep up with that increase in the cost because of inflation. That is all we are talking about.

We are not talking about a new program. We are not talking about any sort of massive new aid for children. We want to keep the children who are out there eating the same food, with the same number of children, and not have a reduction in the number of children or the kind of food they eat. Purely and simply, you can slice it any way you want to, what we are talking about here today is children. Children are the issue that is before the House and the Congress of the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GOODLING, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PERKINS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the discussion is very, very misleading. Someone is throwing around the figure of 7 percent. There is no justification whatsoever for it. Those figures are not available anywhere. You cannot go to the Agriculture Department or you cannot go anywhere and get a figure, as a matter of fact, that the cost-of-living increase over that period of years was 7 percent. It does not exist.

Second, I would tell my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE], as a matter of fact that I am not for a universal free meals program and I am not for 25-cent reduced-price meals. If he would have been here earlier in my career, he would have found out that I was the Member, as a matter of fact, who fought against both.

But let me point out also that the important thing is that the best figure we have at the present time is \$1.50. That is the average cost of these meals. That figure, I say to my dear colleagues, is going up every year, every year, and every year. Just go and

get the statistics. And that figure includes about 70 cents for labor.

So let us not look at percentages here and percentages there. The cost to produce a meal, the average meal in the United States, has consistently gone up, and now the average cost as of last year was a buck and a half. That has gone up since that time, and as a matter of fact, that is an average cost. In some places it costs much more.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for a very important and impressive statement, and I want to underline what he said when he talked about labor.

We are talking here about some of the most underpaid people in this country. People who know what the wage schedule is and people who prepare and serve food in these school kitchens ought to understand that that is part of what we are talking about. It is not simply the cost of food. We do not buy it and throw it at the kids. People have to cook it, people have to serve it, and people have to clean up after it, and we are talking about a very underpaid group of people to begin with.

So when you deny a cost-of-living increase, you are saying to the school district, I assume, "Don't give those people who work in that food preparation, in the cleaning up, and in the serving an increase that year, because they are just not going to get one."

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania because I believe he has provided real leadership on this.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and I have been very impressed with this thorough work on the charts that he presents to us. But if I may be allowed to scramble a little Shakespeare, I would like to say that the expense of his scholarship and thoroughness is a "waste of shame."

It is a waste of shame because he expends it in the wrong place. We never see him bring the charts and the diagrams forward when we are talking about waste where there should be cuts made, and that is in the defense area. Even in circumstances where we were discussing inordinate costs for nuts and bolts purchased by the defense contractors, or ashtrays, toilet seats, and coffee pots, our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, never came forward with his charts.

It is a waste of shame because he never bothered to come forward and discuss the facts concerning the MX missile, which most experts have agreed is not vital to our defense. It is a closing of the window of vulnerability in one case, or it is a bargaining chip in another, but they have never really said that it was vital to our defense. Our colleague did not come forward to challenge the expenditure of \$74 million for each MX missile or talk about the fact that each one of those MX missiles requires a superhardened silo which will cost another \$150 million per missile. So each MX missile costs \$74 million, plus \$150 million, and the charts and the graphs never came forward to point out the absurdity of that expenditure for a weapon which we do not really need in our defense arsenal to begin with.

It is also a waste of shame because of the fact that he has chosen to do a very thorough job on attacking programs which are primarily aimed at children. It has been documented recently that of all the people who receive entitlement programs, our children are the ones who are now getting the least amount from our Government and who have the greatest needs. These are programs to feed hungry children.

I will not pretend that the children of my district are like those in Ethiopia, but it is 1 of the 10 poorest districts in the country. I think, in terms of family income, my district ranks 10th among the poorest. In New York City we have 3 other districts which are among the 10 poorest, so we have 4 congressional districts in New York City which are among the 10 poorest districts in the country with respect to family median income. These are children who are hungry. I am not going to say it is like Ethiopia, that they are starving and they will not survive. But they are hungry, and a consensus was reached in the country that the nutritionally starved, those who are getting enough in their bellies but who are still not getting the proper nutrition, should be made a priority, that if we do not feed children properly when they are young if they do not get the right nutrition, then their ability to learn and their capacity for learning is diminished. Other types of problems psychologically and physically arise as a result, and problems arise medically which later on we pay for through Medicaid. I think the attempt to lower the cost of Medicaid was one of the motivating factors which led to an increased emphasis on programs which provide sound nutrition for young children. So we will pay now or we will pay more later.

It is a waste of scholarship because we cannot afford to pay for what would happen if we did not provide or if we do not continue to provide adequate nutrition programs.

Finally, I would like to thank again our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for setting the record straight about the credibility and reliability of statistics that are being thrown at us. We really do not have sound statistics to show that the increases are that great, but more important than that is the fact that when we talk about increases, we must ask, what is the base? The base is 1981-82 when the cuts were made, when these programs took a disproportionate amount of the cut to begin with. We have cut a program drastically, and now we are talking about the percentages of increases from year to year, which really means that with these increases we are trying to get back to a reasonable state of appropriation that existed in 1980.

So what is at stake is the provision of a program for those who have been deemed to be those most in need in our society right now, the children of America, the children who are under attack. And they are under attack in order for us to sort of balance the budget and reduce the deficit when there is no sincerity among those who argue that the children must wait until the deficit is taken care of or the budget is balanced.

There is no sincerity there, Mr. Chairman, because those same people refuse to recognize the fact that the real waste is in defense.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I beg, as I guess we all do, the indulgence and the attention of the Members because I think there are a number of things that need to be said on this bill. And there are a lot of things that need to be said about this particular amendment.

This, make no mistake about it, is the key amendment that will be considered in H.R. 7. If any of the amendments are going to pass, this is the one that ought to pass. And, it is the only amendment left in front of us that I am going to support. Other amendments will suggest that what we ought to do means tests, and that we ought to cut the cash commodities and all that sort of thing. I do not happen to agree with those amendments.

And my position has been significantly misrepresented over the weekend. Let me make it very clear that I do not agree with the other amendments that are going to be offered and I am not going to support them, but I think this amendment has merit. I think it ought to be considered, and I call it to the attention of the Members.

A lot of Members are getting up here in debate and saying that because somebody votes to increase defense,

they cannot vote to have a freeze in child nutrition. In all due respect, we all have different priorities. I happen to have different priorities than the gentleman from Texas, but let's respect his.

Many of us in this body, Democrat and Republican alike, who believe that the budget we passed in this Congress was inadequate, and that what we ought to do in terms of a justifiable, consistent public policy is begin with a freeze on everything. Then, above and beyond that, make cuts. I challenge anybody in this House to take a look at my voting record thus far, because they will find that consistency in my record. I have voted for a freeze on defense, I will consistently vote for a freeze on defense in fiscal year 1986, and I will vote for that freeze in other programs as well.

Now, the fact that this Congress is making a mistake in increasing defense authorizations does not justify that we then abandon any effort at fiscal responsibility in this Congress and let every program increase *carte blanche*, whatever we want the cost of living to be.

Let us understand as well that the amendment before us at this point in time does not freeze the child nutrition programs and does not freeze the School Lunch Program. This particular amendment simply freezes the rates.

If you have a small school in your district of, say, 300 students and next year the enrollment goes up to 325, you are going to get reimbursement for all 325 children if they participate in the School Lunch Program. We do not freeze the program at the present level. We freeze the rate. So each School Lunch or Child Nutrition Program will be able to respond. They will simply have to, in 1986-87, respond at the same level they are doing in 1985-86, because on July 1 of this year they received a 4½-percent increase in rates.

Now, I would also suggest to the Members that if they look at the facts on the adjustment in rates that occurred on July 1 of this year, they will find that something very interesting happened. In terms of the cash subsidy, we actually had an increase of from 12 to 12½ cents. In terms of the commodity subsidy, we actually had a decrease from 12 to 11½ cents. Why? Because the cost of food in this country has gone down.

So to suggest that the cost of food is going up and, therefore, we have to have a cost-of-living increase in the rates because, if we do not have that, the programs are going to be decimated simply does not stand up to the facts that are before us.

What we are talking about, if we have a one-time freeze in rates, 1986 to 1987, would be a savings, according to the Congressional Budget Office, of

\$26 million the first year, \$199 million the second year, and \$236 million the third year. That is the calculation from the Congressional Budget Office.

Now, I would suggest this when you listen to the arguments that are put up against this:

First, that you cannot freeze this because you are not freezing defense, I would suggest that we freeze all of them.

Second, people are going to suggest that food prices are going up, and I think I have indicated that that is not the case.

□ 1310

Third, a number of my colleagues have tried to make the allegation, "Well, Mr. GUNDERSON, in committee you offered an amendment that provided for funding for the School Milk Program, a restoration that cost \$15 million."

"Now, we agreed to that, but we are going to eliminate that if you talk about a freeze, because you are being hypocritical."

First of all, I think that is poor politics and poor policy if that game is going to be played. That amendment was being done from a public policy perspective, and let me talk about that. The special School Milk Program will cost \$15 million. That was added back in committee because everyone on both sides of the aisle recognized that an oversight and a mistake in Gramm-Latta in 1981, where the policy decision was made on milk in school programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GUNDERSON was allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the policy argument in 1981 was that we would include the milk in the total school lunch reimbursement. I support that. For the most part, we ought not to have a special fund for milk. What we ought to have, however, and recognize, is that those young people, pre-school, kindergarten children, who go half days and do not participate in the School Lunch Program, were thereby eliminated from participation in school milk because they did not participate in the school lunch. All we were saying in that amendment, a corrective amendment, is that every student ought to be allowed to participate in school milk, either through the school lunch, or if not the school lunch, the School Milk Program.

Now, I would suggest, everyone take a look at what I am supporting here in the freeze. Then take a look at that other special milk amendment, and we are more than living at a freeze in terms of overall cost outlays. I would suggest that consistency is on my side.

I would invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize this is the key amendment. This is the time Democrats and Republicans alike will determine whether or not we believe the budget resolution that passed this House is inadequate and whether or not the fairest way to deal with the issue of the deficit is to start with an across-the-board freeze and then deal with cuts above and beyond that if we so choose.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Now that I have completed that statement, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation of why he had to vote for extra money for milk. Those of us who did not vote for Gramm-Latta I guess are not compelled to try to undo its mistakes.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Incidentally, I would reject that, because every argument that has been made on your side of the aisle is that we are trying to correct all the cuts that were made in Gramm-Latta on the school lunch. So I do not think your side agrees with the argument the gentleman just made.

Mr. FRANK. Well, if the gentleman will yield further to me, having given me 14 seconds, which I deeply appreciate before the gentleman interrupted me, if he would yield further, I would just say that we do not feel any great compulsion to single out particular things on the basis of something similar that was stated before when we started; but since the gentleman has brought up milk and he talked about his consistency in voting for defense and keeping it down, in my judgment since I have gotten here, the gentleman and I have often debated the dairy program, the dairy program as I understand it is not a nonmeans test of entitlement, it has been an anti-means test of entitlement; the bigger you are, the more money you get.

I wonder if the gentleman would describe to us his cost-cutting record with regard to the dairy program since the gentleman came here in 1981, which is a program which in sheer fiscal terms blinds the School Lunch Program in terms of its impact on the budget.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe the gentleman would give me the opportunity to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GUNDERSON was allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the additional 3 minutes to talk about one of my favorite subjects

and to indicate to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, exactly what has happened in the dairy program.

We are going to get into the farm bill debate a little bit earlier than I expected. But let us talk about what happened in 1983. At that point in time, we had a \$2.5-billion annual expenditure for the Dairy Price Support Program in this country. I did not justify that. I do not think anyone else does.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FRANK. That was 1983 the gentleman was talking about?

Mr. GUNDERSON. That was \$2.5 billion.

Mr. FRANK. As a result of the legislation the gentleman voted for in 1981 when we had a chance to vote the other way, the gentleman has picked a convenient starting point.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Well, let me explain the program to the gentleman. The fact is that if you take a look at dairy price supports, and the gentleman very well knows they have gone down from \$13.10 in 1981 to \$11.60 at the present time. There has been no increase in support to the dairy farmers of this country.

Second, above and beyond that, we passed a diversion program which saved the American taxpayers over a billion dollars in the first year alone of that program.

Third, we are going to have a farm bill appear next week that is going to have a dairy provision which is going to bring the taxpayer cost of the dairy support program down to \$800 million. I think the dairy farmer will consistently tell you that he has more than done his job to support the efforts of budget reduction and deficit reduction in this country and it is a record I can be very, very proud of in that regard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have sat here while three or four or perhaps more Members have talked about consistency vis-a-vis the defense program or milk or other things. It seems to me that there are decisions and priorities that this House has to make. It seems to me the inconsistency is on the other side for those who have, and I believe probably will when we get another chance, vote to reduce the increases in the defense program and it seems to me that for the sake of consistency they should be willing not to reduce the School Lunch Program, but at least to limit the rate of increase.

As the gentleman has said during his debate, in fact we are debating one amendment, that single solitary

amendment that would improve and reduce the rate of increase by limiting at 1 year's worth of COLA on this one program. There is no other item before this House. It is only that attempt to begin to try to put the Federal increase in the deficit into some sort of perspective and to try to put some limits on it. That is the only bill that is before us.

For those who want to cut defense, leaving aside the argument on national security, I would hope they would also find some ways to at least limit the rate of increase in other programs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think here we should not mix apples and oranges. There is only one issue here. The cost of producing a meal is going up. If you get your statistics, you will see that. The average cost is now a buck and a half. That was last year. It has gone up since that time.

Why does it go up? Well, there are many reasons it goes up. Food is just one of the smaller ones probably, but it goes up because labor goes up, repairs go up, everything they do goes up and that price is going up, too.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7 and in opposition to this amendment. Let me try to bring this issue back to what we are talking about in terms of the program that is involved here in terms of nutrition benefits for children, but also the budget question as well. All of these have been raised during this debate. I think they need to be addressed.

Let us talk about the budget issue first of all. Now, I realize that every Member can have their own particular budget. Four hundred thirty-five Members can have their own particular agenda and this may or may not fit into their particular guidelines. I recognize that; but as an institution, we adopted a budget resolution. It was adopted by the House. It was adopted by the Senate. That budget resolution provided additional funds for nutrition purposes, because both the House and the Senate recognized the importance of dealing with this issue. So from a budget resolution perspective and from the perspective of the Budget Committee, this bill meets those targets, period.

Now, you can all argue your own particular agenda, but from the point of view of the budget resolution that passed the House, that passed the Senate, and that we are now abiding

by as an institution, this bill meets that target.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman suggesting that the House-Senate conference report that saves only \$39 billion is really going to address the deficit that we face in 1987 and 1998?

Mr. PANETTA. I am not going to debate that issue.

Mr. PURSELL. I am just asking the gentleman the question.

Mr. PANETTA. I have made the point that this fits the budget resolution. If the gentleman wants to make a different point that somehow it does not fit the budget resolution, I am pleased to hear it; otherwise, I am not going to yield.

Now, second, with regard to nutrition programs, make no mistake about it, these programs have taken their cuts. If you want to cut programs, we have cut these programs. In 1981 we cut \$12 billion over 4 years from nutrition programs. We cut it from the food stamp program, about \$7 billion and \$5 billion from these particular programs.

So there is no question that these programs have taken their share of the cuts. As a matter of fact, 3 million children go without school lunches today as a result of those cuts, 1 million of whom are poor children.

Third, with regard to the budget question, we are talking about the cost of living formula. This amendment does not guarantee any savings. It essentially says you are not going to have a cost of living formula.

Now, as we all know in a cost of living formula, if the price, if the cost of food services goes down, you do not get a cost-of-living increase because it has gone down. If it goes up, then you do.

So it seems to me to leave the formula in place merely reflects what in fact the cost of food services will be. That is a legitimate formula.

Now, yes, I know that there have been efforts to cut COLA's across the board and there is a lot of debate on that, but we did not do it. We did not do it on defense. We did not do it with regard to retirees. We do not do it with regard to indexing in the tax structure. We have not done it on highways.

So the argument now is that this is the place to start with children in School Lunch Programs. Children today in our society in this country are the new poverty class. One out of four children is below the poverty line. We are talking about a transition in our society that we had better be aware of. One out of four children is in poverty. We are going to pay for that.

You are talking about saving money. Let me tell you what the cost will be if we continue a society in which we do not meet those nutrition needs. We already know from the WIC Program what the results are. Every dollar we spend on the Women's, Infants' and Children's Feeding Program, we save \$3 in health care costs.

Do not kid yourselves. You are going to pay one way or the other and it makes much more sense to invest in good nutrition programs than to have to pay in Medicaid costs to take care of a low-weight birth baby or to take care of a child that is born disabled or to pay for compensatory education in schools or to pay for disabled children in schools. That is the cost.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for making, I think, one of the most significant statements that could be made on this program.

I was a little lost when I first came in. I did not know whether we were talking about frozen milk—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PANETTA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I said that I was a little confused when I came in. I did not know whether we were talking about frozen milk, which is not bad, ice milk, or freezing children literally, or whether we were talking about freezing them psychologically in terms of stunting their growth physically.

I have asked the gentleman to yield to me, and without ascribing motives to anyone, certainly not to the maker of the amendment, but I think this is a time when we ought to really understand what is going on. All the cuts that we have talked about and imposed throughout this session of Congress on the part of many Members of this House are not designed to tackle the deficit. They are designed to end programs.

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], I do not care what the gentleman says, how assiduously he and his Budget Committee members have worked to come up with cuts, certain people in this House just are not going to be satisfied. They are ideologically opposed to our Government meeting its responsibilities to certain of our citizens. That is the bottom line.

I am not impugning any motives to the gentleman. I deliberately said that I would not do that. I said that some Members have that as their objective.

If we go along with this, we are going to cut and cut and cut until they have achieved their objective; no programs for the poor, no programs for children, no programs for senior citizens, but monstrous programs for a military that is designed to maim and kill.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7, which would extend through fiscal 1988 five expiring School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs and also targets new funding for fiscal 1986 for the expansion of proven programs.

It is argued that current law provides generous nutrition benefits to children. It is said that the commitment to child nutrition can be kept through a maintenance of overall fiscal year 1985 funding levels and that there are flaws that need to be corrected. This administration is correct in saying that there are flaws in the program. The flaws arose because of the budget cuts in the Child Nutrition Programs enacted in 1981 that are still having an impact and that we have yet to correct. H.R. 7 proposes to correct these flaws.

After the 1981 cuts, there was a drop of 3 million children in the School Lunch Program with a great many being from low-income families. Some 2,700 schools had to discontinue participation in the School Lunch Program and some 400,000 children and 800 schools stopped participating in the School Breakfast Program.

In February of this year, a physicians' task force found that the problem of hunger in the United States is now more widespread and serious than at any time in the last 10 to 15 years. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, there are 1 million more children eligible for free and reduced-price meals than there were in 1981, but there has been no increase in the number of free and reduced-price meals served.

In the 98th Congress, we tried to correct the inequities brought about from the 1981 cutbacks. We tried to combat the rising problem of hunger in the United States. The effort was said to be excessive, containing inadequacies, crippling, budget busting. And now, at this very moment, H.R. 7 asks for an increase in funding of \$121 million—a much smaller increase as compared to the \$370 million increase passed by the House last year that the Senate failed to act on. Yet, it is still excessive, inadequate, crippling in the eyes of some.

How long will we continue to play these games at the expense of our children? There are those that need to be honest with themselves instead of pretending to be in support of these programs and the intent of the legislation while introducing weakening amendments that chip away at the very infrastructure of the program.

How long will we, in support of this legislation, have to fight to feed our children? It is time to rectify this situation. H.R. 7 is the way.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I would be pleased to yield. I would like some time to conclude my remarks, but I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, I will get the gentleman more time if I can. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman raised several important points in relation to the WIC Program and others which I think it should be noted are not affected by this amendment.

I agree with the gentleman that we need to maintain and support those programs.

My question to the gentleman is this: What is the practical impact of not giving a cost-of-living adjustment in this particular program, or what is the practical impact on the program if we adopt the Bartlett amendment?

Mr. PANETTA. The practical impact is a cut if food service costs go up.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PANETTA. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. TAUKE. I contend that is not correct. My contention is that because the cost of food has in fact been declining and because the cost-of-living adjustments have been greater than the cost of food purchases, have gone up faster than the cost of food purchases, that the program will be maintained at current levels without the cost-of-living adjustment for 1 year.

I guess that is the argument which I do not think has been focused on very well this morning.

Mr. PANETTA. The gentleman wins either way. I mean, if seems to me you should support this kind of amendment if the argument is that the costs are going to do down, then the gentleman has absolutely nothing to fear. My concern is that the cost may go up.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. TAUKE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PANETTA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

□ 1325

Mr. TAUKE. That is just the point. The cost-of-living adjustment is not based on what the cost of food is. The cost-of-living adjustment by which this program is indexed is based on an index that does not have anything to do with the costs in the programs.

It seems to me that we can maintain the program.

Mr. PANETTA. My understanding is that it maintains the cost of providing food services, and that, it seems to me, that has everything to do with this program.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Maybe the gentleman is an expert. Members over there talk about food only.

Is this a program in which the food is prepared by volunteers out in the open? Do the kids come to tents in the field, and nice ladies in the neighborhood make it for free so that we don't have any maintenance costs, and we don't have any heating costs, or any food preparation costs? Because I get the sense that Members over there think somehow that the food is automatically prepared, automatically prepares itself, and the kids just eat it, and there is not anybody else involved, because all we hear about is the cost of food, not anything about the cost of labor or any other costs.

Do we have a lot of volunteers making this food for nothing?

Mr. PANETTA. As the gentleman well knows, this is all done by school employees who are trying to prepare this food within a school situation, and struggling for equipment and costs within that kind of situation.

So that is the purpose of having this cost increase, to try to meet that additional cost that one can anticipate. If it goes down, then admittedly we will not have to worry about the cost increase. But that is the purpose.

If I could take the remaining time to complete my remarks, I have taken much more time than I anticipated, but let me just say this: We are seeing serious statistics around the country in terms of the shameful hunger that is taking place. Let us recognize that it is happening in soup kitchens, it is happening in food pantries, and we see it in the statistics impacting on infants throughout the country.

We do a lot of talking about dealing with hunger in this institution. I do not think there is a Member here that is not concerned about the hunger problem. We do a lot of talking and we form select committees. We pass resolutions. But it is time to do something and this does something.

We do not just talk about it here. We need time to take action. This is the right thing to do from a budget point of view. It is the right thing to do from a human point of view, and it certainly is the right thing to do from a national point of view.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding just briefly because I think it is important for everyone to understand the facts.

The 7-percent increase in school meal costs is based on the total cost of a meal, representing food, labor, and other inputs. It was an analysis that has been done, that is available to all Members by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and it is based on all inputs.

On the other hand, the adjustment that has been made has been the 21-percent adjustment based on the cost at commercial food outlets, and that is where the disparity is.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman and I rise in support of the amendment.

I just wanted to read into the RECORD the appropriation level since the so-called Gramm-Latta fight happened in 1981. At that time, the appropriation was \$2,045 million. Since that time, the increase in this program during the same period when enrollments in schools went down—in 1982, the appropriation was \$2 billion. In 1983, it went to \$2.2 billion, and the appropriation in 1984 went to \$2.3 billion. The 1986 budget which we are discussing today, the appropriation is \$2.7 billion. Hardly any reductions.

So if you look at the increases that we have provided in this program, we are talking about \$670 million additional money. All we are trying to do is maintain a reasonable level of appropriations for a very important program.

I think that has to be balanced off in the context of the deficit including 1986, 1987, and 1988.

So somewhere there has to be a common denominator, and if every subcommittee starts coming in here and adding money to housing, adding money to clean water, and water projects, and defense budgets, and so forth, I just think we have lost our sense of consistency and fiscal discipline. This freeze amendment is a fair and responsible fiscal position. Let's control our spending. Let's keep our eye on the staggering deficit.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would reject this amendment to freeze the reimbursement level for the School Lunch Program. I would hope that we would do it because we ought not to engage in misleading people who are listening to this debate, and we ought not to engage in misleading ourselves, because this is not a free freeze. This is not a freeze that you can impose without doing harm to the children who participate in this program, because the simple fact that we freeze the Federal reimbursement rate to the schools does not mean that that is the end of the decisions that must be made.

All of us come from areas where school districts are tugged and pulled between the decisions they must be making and declining revenue and what kinds of programs to offer. And the School Lunch Program goes into that equation.

As we withdraw our support, we have already seen around this country that schools have made a determination that they are better off not offering a program at all, or raising the cost to the paying children.

But more importantly, what we are seeing is the very children who need this program the most have dropped out, and they have not returned in the same numbers that we have seen the paying children start to come into this program.

For the poor children enrolled in this program, for many of them, this program provides one-third to one-half of their dietary requirement. This is where they get their nutrition.

For those of you who were not here or who have not read the studies, one of the reasons we have this program is to try to allow those children to fully develop their intellectual capabilities. Study after study after study told us what happens to hungry children in the schoolroom. It is not just that they do not learn, but they become restive, they become unsettled, and they spill over into the time of the other children in the program and they make teaching much more difficult. And when we looked at why that happened, clearly it was a lack of proper nutrition for so many of those children who were being sent to school hungry or were not receiving any kind of nourishment throughout the school day.

This is a crucial program. It is a crucial program at a time when this country is becoming more awakened to not only the problems of hunger in Ethiopia, but the problems of hunger in the United States. As the gentleman from California pointed out, children are the fastest-growing class of poor people in this country today. Through no fault of their own, they find out that they are poor. The most desperate group of people we find are the working poor who are trying to find and meet their food consumption needs throughout the month. So many of them are out of food.

What happens to their children? The School Lunch Program is the support system for that group. To suggest that somehow you can vote for this and it is free, it is not. The impact is direct, and the impact is immediate upon those school districts that must then determine what is the allocation that they are prepared to make at the local level.

So I would hope that Members of the House would understand that, and that they would reject this amend-

ment, because it is a devastating amendment.

We were told that the cuts of 1981 would have no impact. In fact, what we know is they have driven millions of children out of the program.

I suggest to you that this freeze translates to a cut in this program, and again we will see the very children that so many people say they want to help, the ones who are called truly needy by the President, they were called truly poor, the poorest of the poor, the desperately poor, those are the children that are enrolled in this program. The question is whether or not we are going to serve them or whether or not we are going to engage in some kind of political doubletalk where we tell our constituents we are really concerned about them, but in fact we vote against them.

So I would hope we would reject the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it is important to try and remember where we have come from since 1981.

We have been asked, and this committee has made significant, and some would say substantial cuts in the child nutrition programs over that period of time. But they were done very skillfully, and they were done in a way to keep this program as a meaningful one for the children of this country.

Notwithstanding that, there has been a large number of children who have been dropped from the program because their schools have dropped the program. The question is, How much more can we cut back in the child nutrition programs without doing even more drastic harm?

First I think it is important to keep in mind what we are talking about when we talk about the cost-of-living increase. We are not talking about the normal CPI. We are talking about the cost-of-living increase which is hued toward what the actual costs are in the School Lunch Program. There is no debate that there will be an increased cost in that program. The CBO estimates it will be 4.6 percent. The administration estimate, using cost-of-living increase data, is a 5.2-percent increase for fiscal 1986.

With this in mind, we ought to ask ourselves what will happen if we do freeze the child nutrition programs and do not allow that modest increase to take place. I think it is important to understand how the School Lunch Program works.

The School Lunch Program reimburses the cities and towns for the free lunches, the reduced lunches, and the paid lunches. If we were to reduce the amount of money going to the communities, the school districts would have an option. They either

heap the increased costs to them onto the paid lunches, or else they ask for tax increases.

We must all speak from our own experience in our own States and communities. In Vermont, due to the cut-backs already made, we have a number of schools dropping out of the School Lunch Program, leaving many children without that option. Others are staggering on. An estimated 60 percent of the schools in Vermont are either breaking even or losing money. We are having problems throughout Vermont in raising additional revenues for our schools. Already they are being forced to make choices between important components of their school program. The freeze being considered here could force even more of these schools to drop out of these valuable programs.

If we continue to cut back we are likely to lose a large number of our School Lunch Programs. The arguments have been very forcefully made by the Members who have talked before me about the problems we are having nationwide with nutrition. The budget resolution reflects that concern and that priority by allowing increases in these programs to try to ameliorate the serious nutrition problem in this country.

The question then is what will we do if we continue to scale back on these programs, modest as these changes may appear to be. Once you put all these proposals together, you end up with serious problems which we are beginning to see in the rural areas now.

As modest as this amendment may seem to be, it could be the most critical and cruel amendment that we have facing the School Lunch Program today.

□ 1340

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this discussion. Indeed, in all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Massachusetts, I really believe perhaps we have milked this discussion enough. Nevertheless, there were some comments made during the discussion that I felt compelled to respond to. Earlier there were some comments made about sincerity, more explicitly, no sincerity.

I am not quite sure what was intended, but from where I was sitting it seemed that the implication was that the framers of the amendment were lacking in sincerity. I felt that that was perhaps a little inaccurate.

I listened to the gentleman from Kentucky talking about the children in the hollows of Kentucky, and I felt the compassion, the understanding, and the sincerity. Indeed, I believe

there is sincerity on both sides. Quite, I think, commendable sincerity.

Before I comment on the gentleman from Texas' amendment I would like to also respond to another point, a point which was made that perhaps there were people on this side of the aisle that were ideologically opposed to the Government's fulfilling of its responsibility to some of its citizens. I would suggest that perhaps everybody that has been involved in this discussion is ideologically committed to the Government fulfilling its responsibility to all the American citizens. The question is really more a matter of not ideological commitment or lack of commitment but a question of the understanding of where the responsibility lies.

In that regard, I was gratified and encouraged by the discussion that focused so much of the attention, I think, so rightly, on the poor in America and the need to feed the poor and to do so with compassion and to concentrate scarce resources, as we have here a case of scarce resources, to be allocated among the competing ends, both within this appropriation bill or in others; to concentrate on the youngsters.

Having made these comments, I would like to also commend the gentleman from Texas. He gives us all a lesson in how to frame and how to defend an amendment.

I appreciate the fine work of the gentleman and his sincerity, and I am happy to yield to him the rest of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words. As the debate winds down, I would like to bring the debate back to some of the crucial points. Point No. 1, this Child Nutrition Program is an entitlement program that is permanently authorized.

So as to the argument that we should not be making amendments today, there are no other opportunities to amend permanently authorized entitlement programs. That is one of the difficulties with the perpetual growth of these programs.

No. 2 is that this amendment does not emasculate or cut the program at all but merely reduces the rate of increase of COLA's for 1 year.

But, No. 3, there has been a great deal of speaking out for the rights of low-income citizens, low-income children. I think it is time that someone on this House floor spoke for those low-income children, because those low-income children have parents who, if we continue the \$200 billion deficits, Federal deficits, will be out of a job

next year. And those low-income children have parents who cannot afford to buy a house because interest rates go up because this Congress cannot get its house in order. And those low-income children will be subject to the ravages of inflation again until this Congress begins to look at the programs one program at a time and to reduce the \$1.5 trillion debt that is hanging over the heads of those children. And it is time that someone speak up for those low-income children and give them a chance, give them a chance to get a job when they graduate, and to buy a home when they want to buy a home, and to be saved from inflation when they become senior citizens.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ATKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the issue really is not the question of the sincerity of the framers of the amendments but, rather, the intent. They would have us believe that this is an amendment, by freezing the School Lunch Program, that would not hurt anybody, would not cause any pain or suffering, that simply because of the fact that food prices have been going down slightly or have been stable that therefore there will not be a cost-of-living increase in this program.

In fact, that is wrong. Food prices and commodities are a small part of the program, and clearly the cost of preparing meals is another factor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to proceed for 2½ additional minutes.)

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ATKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is not whether those meal prices are going down, because they are not. No meal prices in this country are going down. But even assuming some kind of precipitous drop in the cost of food in this country, what would then happen is that the food, that the local school districts would be reimbursed less and the money would go back to the Treasury. But what would happen is, as GAO has predicted and everybody else who has looked at this, if you put a freeze on and the price goes up, as everybody knows, the price of meals will go up, and this amendment is accepted, we will see hundreds of thousands of poor children denied adequate nutrition because one of two things will

happen. Either they will reduce the number of children in the program, they will reduce the amount or the quality of the food.

So let us not pretend that this is an amendment that is harmless, that because of some stability in the price of food, would not cause any pain and suffering. Let us understand this amendment for what it is: It is an effort and a very deliberate effort to deny adequate nutrition to poor children in the School Lunch Program. We have already done that with Gramm-Latta in 1981.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, because I do believe we have gone on very long here, I would like to reclaim my time and close up.

I just wanted to thank the gentleman for correcting the record and making clear to me that he was talking about intent instead of sincerity on this side, because indeed it was the word "sincerity" or lack of sincerity that was stated several times over, and I am sure that nobody there intended to question the sincerity of Members on this side, nor to call into question any ideological commitment that we may not have regarding the responsibility of this Congress to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1981 our President promised the very poor of the poorest of this Nation a safety net. I think we all would agree that in 1981 during the Gramm-Latta debate on the budget cuts there were some on this side of the aisle, and I was one, who reluctantly said that the Gramm-Latta amendment would be adopted by the House. We accepted those severe cuts, and as one who chaired the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation, we have had the opportunity since 1981 to go out to the different States and to the different cities and to see and evaluate the real impact that these 1981 severe budget cuts have had on the poor.

For us to be here today and talk about the school lunch and nutrition programs for the poor, I would just like to ask the chairman of the committee: When we talk about this freeze under this amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT, is it not true that we are talking about 87 percent of the children that we are talking about are the poorest of the poor, some \$1.30 per day per meal goes directly to those who are not paying any funds at all, who are the poorest of the children of this Nation, and only 24 cents comes from paying students.

I strongly oppose this amendment and support the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the documentation in the committee was that 87 percent of the money goes to poor children.

That is not, in my opinion, debatable. Surely every member on the committee knew about it. This is not just a matter of whether or not there is an increase being advocated by the committee.

The Bartlett amendment is an actual cut. Regardless of the question of inflation, it is pretty obvious that if inflation goes up, this cut will be much deeper; and if the cost of living does not go up or down, as has been implied, then this reimbursement would go down.

So that is clear. That is not debatable.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. In other words, this amendment today would not be even-handed if you are talking about the people that President Reagan talked about in 1981 in trying to protect. We do not want those to slip through the safety net.

I would urge my colleagues not only to think in terms of that safety net that our President promised.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I put to rest one point which I think has been incorrectly raised, and that is the pitting of this type of program against defense items.

No one on this side, as far as I know, certainly not the sponsors of this particular proposal, are suggesting that somehow the money that might be saved in this program would be used in defense or that the defense money which might be escalated would be taken away from this program. We are simply suggesting, and I think we should end this dichotomy, that we are pitting one program against another. We are simply suggesting on the basis of the testimony before the committee that we should deal with these programs on the basis of the individual merit of each of the programs.

If there is an item in the defense program that is meritorious, that is warranted, then that should be the merit upon which we would deal with that item. In the same way, we ask you to deal with this on the basis of its

merit and not to pit it one against the other.

I think this has gone on too long. I think it is to the detriment of those of us, some of us, who vote for the increase in many defense items. Some of us are the biggest spenders because we not only vote in the defense bill for certain increases, and I am guilty of some of those increases, but we also look at the humane aspects of some of the domestic programs. We dealt with the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who actually increased an amount in this bill. But he definitely documented a need for that increase in the milk program to kindergarten children.

We dealt with that on the basis of merit. I am a little surprised today that others will not be as consistent in dealing with these issues on the basis of merit and not whether it is domestic versus the Defense appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FORD of Tennessee was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Hopefully, my colleagues on this side of the aisle will protect the safety net that the President has talked so much about. But as I close, I would like to point out that many of my colleagues have already discussed today the governmental agencies that have released reports within the last 2 or 3 years addressing the real impact on the nutrition program and the impact it has had upon the children of this Nation. We heard from the physicians' task force which was headed up by Dr. Larry Brown at Harvard University which indicated to us that somewhere between 15 and 20 million people in this country every month go hungry for some 2 days out of a month.

Also, we were able to back that information up with the Congressional Research Service as well as the Congressional Budget Office, that showed us that the trend of poverty among children in this Nation has doubled between the years 1972 and 1984. We are talking about more than 14 million children or 22.2 percent of all children in this Nation today who are living below poverty. If we look closely at this amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is before us today, we will see that poor children of this Nation will be impacted the greatest. Passing this amendment up would not protect the safety net that the President told the American people and promised the poor of the poor. The children of this Nation who are not here with us today, who do not have those lobbyists, who can't talk to their Representatives, ought to be protected through the voices of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill offered by the chairman of the committee and to reject this amendment which is before us now.

□ 1355

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman would yield briefly, and I respect what the gentleman has said and respect the gentleman from Tennessee a great deal; we have worked on a lot of legislation together. On the issue of the safety net, so that the record will be clear, this amendment would not affect that. There is no low-income child that would be denied a free lunch; every low-income child below 130 percent of poverty would continue to be entitled to a free lunch and any child below 185 percent of poverty would continue to be provided with a reduced-price lunch. This amendment would make no change in that whatsoever.

Mr. VENTO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. VENTO. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his statement, and I want to point out that he is precisely right in pointing out this does affect low-income students much more adversely.

A freeze means a projected cut of a half a cent for regular students in the lunch program, but it means a cut of 4½ cents for poor children because the Federal Government pays more for low-income individuals.

So notwithstanding the comments of our friend from Texas, this I think focuses in on what the actual effect of his amendment is in terms of low-income students, and those are precisely the students that need that type of support and deserve the support of Members of this body.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very intently to the debate, and I think there have been some very good points made on both sides of the aisle. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] has made a very important point.

I think it is sad and not in keeping with the principles of good debate when we have an issue like this and we start comparing it to the military budget. I think it should be based on its own merits, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] makes a very serious, serious point when he says that the President assured us that we did not want to shred the safety net.

I called the superintendent of schools for my district during the course of the debate, because I probably know less about this subject than anybody that has talked here today. I asked him what the impact would be in my district and would there be a chance that some children would be missing a meal? He assured me that yes, indeed, there would be some.

So in keeping with the President's promise that we do not want to shred the safety net, this is one Republican that is saying, I am in doubt. Because I am in doubt, I am going to vote in favor of the children.

We have found ourselves, this Congress, very generous in helping the starving of the world; and I played an active role in some of those bills, and I was proud of that; but for God's sake, we have a similar responsibility to those in this country, and I applaud those on both sides of the aisle for the way the debate has been handled. For myself, I am going to go with the President and his promise that we do not want to shred that safety net; I am going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak out to you today in opposition to this freeze amendment. We cannot afford to reduce the scope of the child nutrition programs if we are to maintain a strong commitment to the health and welfare of this Nation's most valuable resource, its children.

Last year, the House passed reauthorizing legislation for these programs by an overwhelming vote of 343 to 72. This year's bill, at one-third of the cost of last year's, is a fiscally responsible bipartisan initiative providing for modest program growth targeted to individuals who are most in need. As others have mentioned, the recently approved House/Senate budget package specifically makes available the authority and outlays for the program restorations included in H.R. 7.

Eliminating the cost-of-living adjustment for the child nutrition programs for even one year will have a detrimental impact. It will result in a significant weakening of the health and nutrition benefits of these programs. We have to remember that 22-percent of the children in this country are poor.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to vote against any amendment that would prevent needy children from receiving adequate nutrition.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the speeches and certainly the intent of

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Ford], it is with some mixed emotion that I rise in support of the Bartlett amendment, but I do just that.

Later this week, we will have a farm bill on the floor that will reduce from the baseline—not a freeze, but reduce from the baseline some \$7.9 billion from the agricultural programs that are involved in the production of the food.

It is tough to do that at a time when the agricultural economy is in its lowest depths since the Depression, but we are going to do that.

What is even tougher for me to do is to make those reductions and still have \$150 billion deficits as far as the eye can see after we do it. Looking out into my colleagues' eyes today, I know that much of what I am saying has substantial agreement.

A lot of people are concerned about the deficit today; each of us, as we have come back from our districts, have suddenly become concerned because of what we see the deficit doing to all of the American people, from the poorest of the poor to those in the middle classes that are not able to take care of themselves.

The issue today is a freeze; not an increase, not a cut, but a freeze. I would never come before my colleagues if I believed that this amendment or any of these amendments was going to do that which has been suggested it will do. If I am doing that, then I will be judged wrong by the acts that come afterwards.

I would never support taking food from the mouths of starving children, but I think what we are talking about today is kids whose families earn \$26,000 and more. What about the 65 percent of the family day care home participants who are over 185 percent of the poverty level and yet receive the equivalent of a free meal? What about approving Federal increases under the name of cost of living in amounts greater than the costs have actually increased, which I believe is at least partially true in this amendment.

Now, the bottom line is deficit reduction, and if in fact this package does not take care of feeding the poorest of the poor and the hungry, let us address that. I believe, not intentionally, but at least from the standpoint of trying to approach fairness and equity, the point is stretched, Mr. Chairman, when you suggest that cost-of-living adjustments straight across the board for the programs in question are taking food and money from the mouths of starving children.

That is why I support these amendments; I think they are fair; I think that we have got to do it in defense and this Member has owned up to that; we have got to do it in agriculture; and if in fact we are doing it to the least among us, then it is going to

be up to us to design programs to do something about a fairer program for the poor.

Today, I believe the Bartlett amendment makes eminent good sense. It is fair; it is equitable, and will give us that impetus for some of the rest of us to do that which we are going to be asked to do where we can really make some major changes in the budget.

For these reasons, I do support the Bartlett amendment and hope my colleagues will also.

Mr. HAWKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. If the cost of a meal goes up and there is no adjustment for inflation, does the gentleman agree that it is necessary for the money to come from someplace because of the cost-of-living adjustment? The gentleman said that a freeze is exactly a freeze.

If the cost of living goes up, the cost of furnishing that meal in the school district also goes up: Where does the gentleman suggest that those expenditures will come from?

Mr. STENHOLM. By making changes in the fundamental approach to the School Lunch Program to see that those who truly need it get it.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking from the mouths of the women, the ladies, the men who work in the school lunch rooms in the 17th District of Texas who say we are putting too much money into the program feeding people that do not need it.

Mr. HAWKINS. Does the gentleman know this, that 87 percent of the money in these programs goes to the poor?

Now let us say that 13 percent go to those other groups. The gentleman is talking about 87 percent; you said that you are supporting this on the theory that you are not taking food from the mouths of poor children.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STENHOLM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAWKINS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman honestly, and I certainly have full confidence in the gentleman's integrity, but does the gentleman really believe that you are supporting this amendment on the basis that no poor child will be deprived of a meal?

Mr. STENHOLM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWKINS. You do?

Mr. STENHOLM. Yes, sir. I do.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, I am afraid that the gentleman just has not listened to the debate; and I regret that the gentleman was not present in the Committee on Education and Labor where the superintendent of schools in the State of Texas had written to this committee indicating that such a freeze would deprive children in the State of Texas.

Now, apparently the gentleman disagrees with that.

□ 1405

Mr. STENHOLM. I certainly do, because I pay more attention to those who work in school lunchrooms and the schoolteachers who teach our children over what in fact is happening in the School Lunch Program than I do to anyone else who may lobby, or what have you. I believe, in all sincerity, that we can meet their needs.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, we can thank those who have been testifying before the committee on this program; those who are supporting these nutrition programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. I just want to make sure, as we close the debate on this issue, that we are focusing properly on what we should be focusing on because we have had a lot of discussion on things that really are not too relevant.

The issue is simply this: The cost of producing a meal each year is going up. The White House is telling us it will probably be about 5.2 percent this year. CBO says probably about 4.6. But the statistics show that the cost of producing a meal is going up. Whether food is cheaper in your area has no concern to this debate. It may be cheaper in your area, it may be more expensive in other areas. It depends totally on the cost of labor to get it to you. But we are not talking strictly about the cost of food. We are talking about how much it costs to produce a meal. Each year it goes up. CBO and the administration is saying it will go up again this year.

Second, if you believe the safety net version, if you believe that we have a responsibility to feed the free and reduced price people, I would say to the gentleman who just spoke, you cannot talk about a reimbursement to paying customers. We do not reimburse paying customers. What we do, we offer reimbursement to try to keep the School Lunch Program going. If we do not, with the exception of three States, nobody has to feed free and reduced price youngsters. Nobody.

Let me tell you our experience in 1981. We found a drop of about 3 million people, many of those, most, probably, were free and reduced price youngsters because the person with the money could pay any amount he wanted to pay for a la carte. We reimbursed each meal simply to keep the program going because we have said that we have a responsibility to feed the free and reduced price meal.

Let me give you two examples which I have given over and over again in my district. After 1981, one district dropped the National School Lunch Program. No big deal. It is a very affluent district. I do not have many, but that one is. And so they were not feeding any free and reduced price. Nobody got hurt. Well, they did get hurt, nutritionally, because I know what many of them bought in lieu of the National School Lunch Program. But very close by, a district that had 1,300 free and reduced price youngsters dropped the National School Lunch Program because of our cuts. They could not afford to keep it going. And so the end result was, 1,300 youngsters not only not nothing at breakfast at home, or anything perhaps in the evening, they got nothing at lunch either, or they did not get a school breakfast program, because they dropped out of the program.

I want you to understand we reimburse to keep the National School Lunch Program going, not reimburse students who are not needy. We decided that we should feed the free and reduced. The cheapest way we know is to keep a national school lunch program going. I do not know of a cheaper way than that, because if you single out those 1,300 students among 7,000 or 8,000 students and you say we are going to set up some kind of a program to take care of them, how do you do it as cheaply as we now do it? Reimbursement is to keep the program going, not to feed nonneedy children. If we do not keep the programs going, then, please, do not talk about safety nets, because except three States there is no safety net. Free and reduced price youngsters just do not get a nutritious meal.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 284, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—143

Archer	Callahan	Dickinson
Armey	Carney	DioGuardi
AuCoin	Chandler	Dreier
Badham	Cheney	Eckert (NY)
Barnard	Coats	Edwards (OK)
Bartlett	Cobey	Fawell
Barton	Coble	Fiedler
Bateman	Combust	Fields
Billakis	Craig	Franklin
Bliley	Crane	Gallo
Boulter	Daniel	Gekas
Broomfield	Dannemeyer	Gingrich
Brown (CO)	Darden	Gradison
Broyhill	Daub	Gregg
Burton (IN)	DeLay	Grotberg
Byron	DeWine	Gunderson

Hansen	Meyers	Shaw
Hartnett	Michel	Shumway
Henry	Miller (OH)	Shuster
Hiler	Miller (WA)	Siljander
Hillis	Monson	Skeen
Holt	Montgomery	Slaughter
Hunter	Moore	Smith (NE)
Hyde	Moorhead	Smith (NH)
Ireland	Nichols	Smith, Denny
Kasich	Nielson	Smith, Robert
Kindness	Oxley	Snowe
Kolbe	Packard	Snyder
Kramer	Parris	Solomon
Latta	Pashayan	Spence
Leath (TX)	Penny	Stenholm
Lent	Petri	Strang
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Stump
Lewis (FL)	Pursell	Sweeney
Lightfoot	Ray	Swindall
Livingston	Ridge	Tauke
Loeffler	Ritter	Taylor
Lott	Roberts	Thomas (CA)
Lowery (CA)	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
Lujan	Roth	Vander Jagt
Lungren	Roukema	Walker
Mack	Rowland (CT)	Weber
Martin (IL)	Rudd	Whittaker
McCandless	Saxton	Wolf
McCollum	Schaefer	Wortley
McEwen	Schuetz	Young (FL)
McGrath	Schulze	Zschau
McMillan	Sensenbrenner	

NOES—284

Ackerman	Dingell	Howard
Akaka	Dixon	Hoyer
Alexander	Donnelly	Hubbard
Anderson	Dorgan (ND)	Huckaby
Andrews	Dornan (CA)	Hughes
Annunzio	Dowdy	Hutto
Anthony	Downey	Jacobs
Applegate	Duncan	Jeffords
Aspin	Durbin	Jenkins
Atkins	Dwyer	Johnson
Barnes	Dymally	Jones (NC)
Bates	Dyson	Jones (OK)
Bedell	Early	Jones (TN)
Bellenson	Eckart (OH)	Kanjorski
Bennett	Edgar	Kaptur
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	Kastenmeier
Bereuter	Emerson	Kemp
Berman	English	Kennelly
Biaggi	Erdreich	Kildee
Boehlert	Evans (IA)	Kleczka
Boggs	Evans (IL)	Kolter
Boland	Fascell	Kostmayer
Boner (TN)	Fazio	LaFalce
Bonior (MI)	Feighan	Lagomarsino
Bonker	Fish	Lantos
Borski	Flippo	Leach (IA)
Bosco	Florio	Lehman (CA)
Boucher	Foglietta	Lehman (FL)
Boxer	Foley	Leland
Breaux	Ford (MI)	Levin (MI)
Brooks	Ford (TN)	Levine (CA)
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Lipinski
Bruce	Frank	Lloyd
Bryant	Frost	Lowry (WA)
Burton (CA)	Fuqua	Lukens
Bustamante	Garcia	Lundine
Campbell	Gaydos	MacKay
Carper	Gedjenson	Madigan
Carr	Gephardt	Manton
Chapman	Gibbons	Markey
Chappell	Gilman	Marlenee
Chappie	Glickman	Martin (NY)
Clay	Gonzalez	Martinez
Clinger	Goodling	Matsui
Coelho	Gordon	Mavroules
Coleman (MO)	Gray (IL)	Mazzoli
Coleman (TX)	Green	McCain
Collins	Guarini	McCloskey
Conte	Hall (OH)	McCurdy
Conyers	Hall, Ralph	McDade
Cooper	Hamilton	McHugh
Coughlin	Hammerschmidt	McKernan
Courter	Hatcher	McKinney
Coyne	Hawkins	Mica
Crockett	Hayes	Mikulski
Daschle	Hefner	Miller (CA)
Davis	Heffel	Mineta
de la Garza	Hendon	Mitchell
Dellums	Hertel	Moakley
Derrick	Hopkins	Molinari
Dicks	Horton	Mollohan

Moody	Rose	Tallon
Morrison (CT)	Rostenkowski	Tauzin
Morrison (WA)	Rowland (GA)	Torres
Mrazek	Roybal	Torricelli
Murphy	Russo	Towns
Murtha	Sabo	Trafficant
Myers	Savage	Traxler
Natcher	Scheuer	Udall
Neal	Schneider	Valentine
Nelson	Schroeder	Vento
Nowak	Schumer	Visclosky
O'Brien	Seiberling	Volkmer
Oaker	Sharp	Vucanovich
Oberstar	Shelby	Watkins
Obey	Sikorski	Waxman
Olin	Sisisky	Weaver
Ortiz	Skeltan	Weiss
Owens	Slattery	Wheat
Panetta	Smith (FL)	Whitehurst
Pease	Smith (IA)	Whitley
Pepper	Smith (NJ)	Whitten
Perkins	Solarz	Williams
Pickle	Spratt	Wilson
Price	St Germain	Wirth
Quillen	Staggers	Wise
Rahall	Stallings	Wolpe
Regula	Stangeland	Wright
Reid	Stark	Wyden
Richardson	Stokes	Wyllie
Rinaldo	Stratton	Yates
Robinson	Studds	Yatron
Rodino	Sundquist	Young (AK)
Roe	Swift	
Roemer	Synar	

NOT VOTING—7

Addabbo	Gray (PA)	Young (MO)
Bevill	Long	
Frenzel	Rangel	

□ 1420

Mr. DORNAN of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DICKINSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk will designate section 9.

The text of section 9 is as follows:

SEC. 9. CHANGE IN TUITION LIMITATION FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

(a) SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS.—Section 12(d)(5) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking out "\$1,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,500"; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "On July 1, 1986, and on each subsequent July 1, the Secretary shall prescribe and annual adjustment in the tuition limitation amount in the first sentence of this paragraph to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers during the most recent twelve-month period for which such data is available."

(b) CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.—Section 15(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (A) by striking out "\$1,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,500"; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "On July 1, 1986, and on each subsequent July 1, the Secretary shall prescribe an annual adjustment in the tuition limitation amount in the first sentence of this paragraph to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers during the most recent twelve-month period for which such data is available."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 9?

Hearing none, the Clerk will designate section 10.

The text of section 10 is as follows:

SEC. 10. USE OF SCHOOL LUNCH FACILITIES FOR ELDERLY PROGRAMS.

Section 12 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Facilities, equipment, and personnel provided to school food authorities for programs under this Act and under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 may be used, as determined by the local educational agency, to support nonprofit nutrition programs for the elderly (including programs funded under the Older Americans Act)."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 10?

Hearing none, the Clerk will designate section 11.

The text of section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. STUDY OF A UNIVERSAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM.

The National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"STUDY OF A UNIVERSAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM"

"SEC. 24. The Secretary shall conduct a study to consider the feasibility of making the school lunch program a universal program for all children and to consider various methods of operating a self-financing school lunch program for all children, including reserving a separate source of revenue for any such program. The Secretary shall submit a report of such study to the Congress, together with any recommendations or proposals for legislation, by January 1, 1988."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 11?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment after line 24 to create a section 12. Is that in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Yes, it is.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 7, after line 24, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 12. SIMPLIFICATION OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.

The National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SIMPLIFICATION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS"

"SEC. 25. The Secretary shall conduct an analysis of program requirements under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to identify program changes that would simplify program operation at the local level. Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the results of such analysis, together with any recommendations or proposals for legislation, to the appropriate committees of the Congress."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the amendment on this side and have no objections to the amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we also have studied this amendment. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment. I think it is an excellent one, and we accept it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the chairman for this support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take very much time, but would just say that one of the problems, again and again, that school districts tell us they have in administering this program is the enormous cost of the complications and the paperwork and the requirements that are sent to the school districts in a rather detailed manner.

This would require the Secretary to conduct an analysis of those detailed program requirements and report back to the Congress what program changes can be made to simplify the program from the perspective of the local government level.

That is, I think, the nexus of the amendment and what is important to focus on. It is not the purpose of this amendment to simplify the program from the perspective of the local government level.

That is, I think, the nexus of the amendment and what is important to focus on. It is not the purpose of this amendment to simplify the program from the perspective of the Federal Government, although that may be a result, but to simplify the implementation of the program at the school district level.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to section 12?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 7, after line 24, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 12. ELIMINATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966.

(a) ELIMINATION OF CASH ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN IN THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH AND SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.—

(1) Section 11(a) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2)(A) The special assistance factor prescribed by the Secretary for free lunches shall be 132.50 cents. The special assistance factor for reduced-price lunches shall be 40 cents less than the special assistance factor for free lunches.

"(B) A two-cent supplemental payment shall be made for each free and reduced price lunch served in a school food authority which, in school year 1984-1985 received a two-cent supplemental payment under this section for each free and reduced price lunch served in the program."

(B) in paragraph (3) (A) by—

(i) striking clause (i); and

(ii) redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively.

(2) The first sentence of section 14(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "national average payment" and inserting in lieu thereof "special assistance factor".

(3)(A) Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "APPORTIONMENT TO STATES".

(B) Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act is repealed and section 11 of the National School Lunch Act (as amended by this section) is redesignated as section 4.

(4) Section 6(a)(2) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking "section 4 of this Act and the amount appropriated pursuant to sections 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4".

(5) Section 7 of the National School Lunch Act is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking out "agricultural commodities and other foods" and inserting in lieu thereof "food and providing meals".

(6) Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(i) by inserting in clause (i) "free or at a reduced price" after "breakfasts served";

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking out ", for reduced-price breakfasts, or for breakfasts served to children not eligible for free or reduced-price meals," and inserting in lieu thereof "or for reduced-price breakfasts,"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(7) Section 8 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) in the second sentence by striking out "agricultural commodities and other foods" and inserting in lieu thereof "foods and provide meals";

(B) in the next to the last sentence, by striking out "national average" and inserting "special assistance"; and

(C) in the last sentence, by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4".

(8) Section 4(d) of the National School Lunch Act, (as redesignated by this section) is amended by striking out "including those applicable to funds apportioned or paid pursuant to section 4 but excluding the provisions of section 7 relating to matching,".

(9) Section 12(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "national average payment rates prescribed under sections 4 and 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "payments prescribed under section 4".

(b) ELIMINATION OF CASH ASSISTANCE FOR NON-NEEDY CHILDREN IN THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM.—

(1) Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(A) by amending subsections (c) (1), (2), and (3) to read as follows:

"(c)(1) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free lunches and suppers and the payment rate for reduced-price lunches and suppers shall be the same as the payment rates for free lunches and reduced-price lunches under section 4 of this Act (as adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act).

"(2) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free breakfasts and the payment rate for reduced-price breakfasts shall be the same as the national average payment rates for free breakfasts and reduced-price breakfasts respectively, under section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act).

"(3) For purposes of this section, the payment rate for free supplements shall be that in effect on September 30, 1985, and the payment rate for reduced-price supplements shall be one-half the rate for free supplements (adjusted pursuant to section 4(a) of this Act)."; and

(B) in subsection (f)(3)(A) by striking out "except that reimbursement shall not be provided under this subparagraph for meals or supplements served to the children of a person acting as a family or group day care home provider unless such children" and inserting in lieu thereof "Reimbursements shall be provided under this subparagraph only for meals and supplements served to children who".

Mr. BARTLETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, and this amendment is likely to be substantially more controversial than the amendment that was just accepted, is to eliminate what is called in the vernacular the middle-class subsidies of the School Lunch Program.

Mr. Chairman, let me take a minute to explain how the School Lunch Program works and how it reimburses lunches for children.

First, there are those school lunches that are reimbursed for children who are poor; that is, their families earn less than 130 percent of the poverty level. That reimbursement would not be affected one whit by this amendment.

Second, there is that program that is called the reduced-price lunch in which children whose families earn between 130 percent and 185 percent receive a reduced-price lunch. Those children are also in the poor or the

near-poor category, and their subsidies and their lunches would not be affected one whit.

But 50 percent of the children who are served school lunches under the Federal School Lunch Program fall into a different category.

Since the incomes or the salaries of the Members of the House of Representatives are a matter of public record, those are the children of every Member of this body. Those are the children whose parents have no means test at all. They earn over 185 percent of the poverty level, with no outside limit, so those are the children whose parents may earn \$20,000 a year or \$50,000 a year or \$100,000 a year or \$200,000 a year.

□ 1440

Mr. Chairman, the tragedy of the present program is that those children or those parents are being reimbursed by the Federal taxpayers at the rate of 25 cents per meal for every meal that they eat. So when Members of this body reach into their pockets and give their children 75 cents or 90 cents for a meal, either here or in their home districts, the Federal taxpayers add another 25 cents to it.

There has been a great deal of debate today about the needs of low-income families and children who would otherwise be hungry. This amendment would reduce or eliminate the cash subsidy for the children who are not low-income and who would not otherwise go hungry.

Mr. Chairman, the program is divided into two parts. Half of it, or 12½ cents, is paid in the form of commodities, and 12½ cents is paid in the form of cash, straight out of tax dollars. My amendment would not affect the commodities or the commodity reimbursement to school districts. It would only eliminate the cash subsidy. It is an amendment that in days of scarce resources, I think this Congress ought to accept. We ought to say for the first time that the purpose of the school lunch program is to provide free or reduced-price lunches to low-income students and not to middle-income students and not to upper-income students.

Let me give the Members some statistics just from last year, Mr. Chairman. Last year 42.4 percent of the School Lunch Program was provided for free lunches for low-income students, 6.8 percent was provided for reduced-price lunches for near-poor students, but a majority of the lunches served, 50.8 percent, was provided for non-needy students.

Mr. Chairman, that is over 2 billion full-priced lunches every year that the taxpayers reimbursed at the rate of 12½ cents in cash and 12½ cents in commodity subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, this is also offered in the context of the other amendments

that were for reductions. I would just urge the House to consider the enormous increases that are built into these entitlement programs in light of the deficit. We understand that the House has rejected other amendments, so now we come down to one that does not bring the program back to neutral, that does not bring the program back to a freeze, but all it does is to reduce \$287 million for the first year out of the cost of these programs. And it does not take that money out of any low-income student. It does not reduce any poverty level child or any child who is less than 185 percent of poverty. This merely will eliminate the 12½ cents cash subsidy that is paid for every child and for every paid lunch, no matter the income.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a change in the school lunch program whose time has come.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the consequences of this amendment would be even more devastating than any of the other amendments that have been presented so far and have been rejected. The implication, first of all, that only children from high-income families would be affected if the high-income subsidy is eliminated is not really correct.

First of all, the money or the reimbursement does not go to the individual; it goes to the school district. This money goes to support the basic infrastructure of the program. So we are talking now about the very heart of the school lunch program.

Let me deal in just very simple arithmetic. Let us assume that a school in a school district had 80 percent paying students and 20 percent of the so-called poor students, those who have reduced-price lunches or those who do not pay for their meals at all. Now, under this amendment, that school would lose that 80 percent because they are paying students. They would lose the 80 percent, and that would be devastating to that School Lunch Program. They would find it uneconomical to operate, so the 20 percent who are needy would then be deprived of the school lunch.

We have a great number of schools obviously in this category, and it does not have to be 80 percent. It could be much lower; it could be 40 percent or 50 percent. If they lost these paying students, then obviously the program would be crippled. That is the consequence of this amendment.

We tried it in 1981. That was really the mandate of the Gramm-Latta proposal in 1981. It was adopted. It was tried, and as a result of that, 3 million children dropped out of the program. That was the actual experience under this amendment, as tried in 1981. There is no reason why it would be any different now.

But even in addition to this, in my opinion, this is a very serious attack on American education because this is the beginning of saying that families should contribute to education based strictly on their income, that there are individuals that should pay for these services within a school. So we begin to stratify the students and stigmatize them. If parents should pay for the meals, why would the parents not also be asked to pay for the textbooks? Why would they not also be asked to pay for the transportation that is furnished? We can get all sorts of logical consequences as a result of this type of reasoning?

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the immediate impact, and the seriousness of this amendment, is that while it seems to indicate that you can make certain students pay and this will help defray the cost it is quite the contrary; it simply cripples the School Lunch Program and it will deprive all of the children, rich and poor alike, of the School Lunch Program.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a serious amendment to consider, and I think the consequences indicate that it should be rejected.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the committee was very kind when he said that this would have a more devastating effect than any other amendments on the program. This would destroy the National School Lunch Program. That is how devastating it would be.

Let us keep in mind that in 1981 we only cut 5½ cents in the basic cash support and we lost 3 million students. That was only 5½ cents. Now, just figure what will happen when we are talking about 12½ cents.

Let us make sure that we understand, first of all, that at the present time we have 12½ cents in cash, we have 11.7 cents in entitlement commodities, and then we have another 10 cents in bonus commodities. You could make the same argument, I suppose, for commodities that you are making now if you want to do away with the cash payment. But you say, "Oh, no, they are surplus," et cetera. Let me tell the Members that they go out as an Agriculture Department and buy those commodities in order to distribute them. So you are looking at a situation where, if you truly believe that the National School Lunch Program is important, you have to find a way to subsidize that program in order to keep it going.

As I said the other day, this all started back when we decided that it was necessary to recruit for World War II, and, lo and behold, we found that that was a difficult thing to do because the nutrition of those we were trying to recruit was so bad that, as a matter of

fact, we had a difficult time getting a standing army, in the true sense of the word. That was true not only of those who came from poor backgrounds but those who came from middle and higher income backgrounds also. So the Congress decided at that time that we thought a National School Lunch Program was necessary.

We said it was necessary also through the years to have a National School Lunch Program so we could insist that youngsters who cannot purchase a meal would have an opportunity for a nutritious meal. We made that decision as a Congress.

If we were to adopt this amendment, we would say to the local school district that we are giving them an out; we are giving them an opportunity not to feed free and reduced-price lunches to people because there is no way under the Sun they are going to be able to raise local taxes to do just that. Those low-income folks are not the people who would scream. It would be the other people who would do the screaming, and the free and reduced-price youngsters would be left by the wayside.

We have to understand that we do not reimburse for paying customers. We reimburse to keep a program going that we happen to think is a very, very important program.

Let me say again that we reduced by 5½ cents in 1981 and we lost 3 million students. Let me also remind the Members that in many areas those who dropped out of the National School Lunch Program were those who were feeding 20, 30, 40, and 50 percent free and reduced-price lunches. If you are feeding all free and reduced-price lunches, this amendment does not bother you at all. If you do not feed any, you probably are from an affluent school district that is so affluent that it could probably make up the difference. But, let me say, that if you are feeding 20, 30, 40, 50, or 60 percent free and reduced-price lunches, your school district is in real trouble if you decide to adopt this amendment at this particular time.

Again let me say that in Pennsylvania, if we were to adopt this amendment, we are talking about a reduction of \$12 million to the State of Pennsylvania. This is not Texas. We are not growing in Pennsylvania. We are an old industrial State. We are having a tough time making ends meet. Our Secretary of Labor and Ambassador Yeutter tell us to tell our people to go and get other jobs, but we do not know where to send them. Things are filling up in Texas, too. But it is also true in Texas. This hurts not just in Pennsylvania.

The gentleman who is in charge of the food service in Texas says this in a letter to me:

The purpose of this letter is to express my concern about the proposed 12¢ cut in sec-

tion 4 funds for the National School Lunch Program. The elimination of section 4 would cause local school districts to increase the price charged to paying students, which would have a negative effect on participation. In 1981-82, after a 5½¢ reduction in reimbursement for paid lunches from the previous year, statewide participation decreased by more than 4,000,000 paid lunches. This represented a loss in average daily participation of 23,700 students. Of course, a 12¢ cut would cause an even greater loss in participation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman goes on to say in his letter:

My real concern with the elimination of section 4 is the affect it would have on the many schools in Texas and throughout the nation that serve a small percent of free and reduced-price meals. These schools would have no incentive to participate in the National School Lunch Program if section 4 were eliminated. Once these schools have dropped the program, the nutritional integrity of their food service operation would be severely hampered, since they would no longer be required to offer lunches which meet certain nutritional standards.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, free and reduced-price youngsters would not have to be fed except in three States in this Nation.

I hope that every Member will look very, very seriously at what this amendment would do to their local school districts. I have statistics for all of our States. I do not have statistics broken down for school districts.

Again let me remind the Members that it will be devastating if you are caught in that area that feeds 20, 30, 40, 50, or maybe 60 percent free and reduced-price youngsters, because that 12 cents is going to take away all of that infrastructure support. Again, let me remind the Members that the cost of meals and the cost to produce and serve meals is going up, not down.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a serious problem with this amendment, and I would certainly hope that the Members will look carefully before making this leap because it will adversely affect their school districts. It will affect all school districts in this country; I do not care which school district it is.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

I feel very strongly that this is probably the worst amendment as far as the destruction of the School Lunch Program. I know that in my own State it is going to have serious ramifications on our schools and school dis-

tricts and could lead to many of them closing if this amendment should pass. So I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the proposition that the gentleman has made.

□ 1455

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confounded over what is happening today. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT], who is a valued member of the Education and Labor Committee, seems to persist in his efforts to dismantle a program that has worked very effectively over the years.

I would suggest that we go to the origin of the legislation. It did not develop easily nor did it occur overnight. The problem was carefully looked at. It existed for a long time. There was a ground swell, slow, but eventually enveloping the mentality of our Nation and the Congress. As a result of it, the Congress developed this program that has been in effect for some number of years and working very effectively.

Why attempt to emasculate it now? The fact is the problem still exists. It will continue to exist as the result of successive generations going to school. Our concern for the nutrition and well-being of the young children of our Nation has not diminished. Our concern for the young children of the world has not diminished. It is manifested in so many ways by the things that we do for people throughout the world.

So it kind of boggles my mind when I see amendment after amendment being offered that would have the net effect of destroying or diminishing this valued program.

Of course, there are statistics. It has been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that there was a loss of some 3 million lunches when we cut the program by 5 cents. If we eliminated all the payments now it would result in some 6 million less lunches, and 18,000 schools dropping out of the program, so in a true sense you are dismantling the program. I simply just do not understand it.

Is the gentleman suggesting that we go back to where we were, even though in piecemeal fashion? In any event I think we have done enough damage to these programs since 1981. Why should we continue to erode whatever benefits there are today?

As far as the needy question is concerned, let me tell you an experience that I have had. I was a young man during the Depression in our Nation. We know who was on welfare. We called it home relief in those days and those folks, the recipients of home relief, were psychologically burdened and they were looked upon in a disdainful manner. Happily, my folks

never did get to that state, although my mother worked as a charwoman for \$8 a week to keep body and soul together and I shined shoes to produce another couple dollars a week. My father had not worked in 4 successive years; but really, the notion of being on home relief was abhorrent, and so be it in this matter—imagine the feelings of the children if only the needy were singled out for free lunches.

Imagine the psychological trauma that would be inflicted on the young folks. These concerns were considered and discussed time and time again in the formulation of the program.

Once again we find a constant effort to diminish the funding. I just do not understand it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. This amendment would cost the gentleman's State almost \$11 million.

Mr. BIAGGI. Pardon me?

Mr. GOODLING. This amendment would cost the gentleman's State almost \$11 million.

Mr. BIAGGI. I appreciate that, but irrespective, I am talking about philosophy, policy, and that is what should be the determination.

Of course, if you cut funding in a fashion which the gentleman's amendment proposes, I think most States will suffer very grievous injury.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman a great deal. We have worked on a lot of amendments together, but I think it does come down to philosophy. Should the Federal taxpayers pay a subsidy for the lunches of children who are not poor? We have agreed that we should pay a subsidy and a free lunch for children who are poor. This amendment would eliminate the subsidy for children who are not poor, with no means test at all. Perhaps later there will be amendments to provide a means test for the middle-income subsidies; but I think the gentleman is correct. It does come down to philosophy as to what Federal tax money should be used to pay for, poor kids or not poor kids.

Mr. BIAGGI. I understand the difference of opinion and I respect the gentleman's perspective.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWIFT). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BIAGGI. But clearly, the question is simple. We have a program that has been in place for a long time. It works. We have seen the product. Go

to schools today and you see the young folks nourished. They look it. You see it on their faces.

I can tell you, it was not always that way. So clearly I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the author of the amendment that we are talking about, it was mentioned earlier that this will not impact the poor students, that we have already dealt with that with the last amendment.

I do not know what the elimination of the 12-cent cash payment, what effect that would have, but the total elimination of the 24 cents would mean about 5.8 million children in 18,000 school districts, and we are talking about maybe over half a million poor children who would suffer from this amendment that is before the House today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. BARTLETT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BIAGGI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is really a difference as to whether we should provide this 12-cent subsidy in cash and 12 cents in commodities, whether we should provide that subsidy to low-income children or to all children, the gentleman's children, mine, all children, without regard to income.

I would suggest, I do not know what the 5 million is that the gentleman suggests, but the fact is that perhaps school lunch prices would increase for middle-income students and upper income students, but it would not increase by one whit for low-income students.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I can appreciate what the gentleman is trying to accomplish in this amendment, but I think we are coming to the table with a strong appetite, but that appetite is also going to spread and we are going to reach out and pick up some additional poor children that we are trying to protect under the bill that is being offered by the committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 7, after line 24, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 12. ESTABLISHING INCOME GUIDELINES FOR SUBSIDIZED MEALS UNDER THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.

(a) APPORTIONMENTS TO STATES.—Section 4(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (1)(A) by inserting "free, reduced-price, or subsidized" after "number of"; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting "free, reduced-price, or subsidized" after "for each" both places it appears.

(b) DIRECT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES.—Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (b) by inserting "free, reduced-price, and subsidized" after "lunches" both places it appears; and

(2) in subsection (e) by inserting "for free, reduced-price, and subsidized lunches" after "in lieu thereof."

(c) INCOME GUIDELINES.—Section 9(b) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subparagraph (1)(A) by striking out "free and reduced-price" and inserting in lieu thereof "free, reduced-price, and subsidized"; and

(2) by inserting after the fourth sentence of subparagraph (1)(A) the following new sentence: "The income guidelines for determining the eligibility for subsidized lunches for any school year shall be 250 percent of the applicable family-size income levels contained in the nonfarm income poverty guidelines prescribed by the Office of Management and Budget, as adjusted annually in accordance with subparagraph (B)."; and

(3) in subparagraphs (2)(A) and (B) by striking out "free and reduced-price" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "free, reduced-price, and subsidized"; and

(4) in subparagraph (2)(B)—
(A) by striking out "reduced-price meal eligibility" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsidized meal eligibility"; and

(B) by inserting "or reduced-price" after "free" in the last sentence; and

(5) in paragraph (4) by striking out "free lunch or a reduced-price" and inserting in lieu thereof "free, reduced-price, or subsidized".

(d) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 9(d) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "free or reduced-price" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "free, reduced-price, or subsidized."

(e) SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 11(e) of the National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" both places it appears after "free lunches" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma; and

(2) by inserting "and the average number of children who received subsidized lunches" after "reduced-price lunches" both places it appears.

(f) COMMODITY ASSISTANCE.—Section 11(f) of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking out "free or reduced-price" and inserting in lieu thereof "free, reduced-price, or subsidized."

(g) APPORTIONMENT TO STATES.—Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) in clause (1)(A)(ii) by striking out "breakfasts served to children not eligible for free or reduced-price meals" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsidized breakfast"; and

(2) in the last sentence of subparagraph (1)(b) by striking out "breakfast served to a

child not eligible for free or reduced-price meals" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsidized breakfast."

(h) This section shall take effect July 1, 1986.

Mr. ARMEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an appropriate time for me to offer this as a substitute, because we are talking here about a philosophy and perhaps a question of equity and fairness. I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT]. I think the gentleman is moving in the right direction.

I have offered an amendment, though, that might modify that effort and perhaps be a little less controversial than the Bartlett amendment.

I think a big part of the question that we have seen debated today and we saw debated earlier on an amendment was a tremendous amount of understanding and compassion and concern and, yes, sincerity, to what extent should we take these very, very scarce Federal dollars that are in so much competition with so many other competing programs and find a way to make them most available and first available to the poor children of America in this program.

Unfortunately, there are not enough dollars so that we can do everything.

If I can review just a little bit of the work that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] did in his dialog, there really are three steps in this program; the first step being for those families who make below 130 percent of the poverty line, where their children do in fact get a free lunch, totally free to the individual family. These, I imagine, are the children that we see in the rural areas of Kentucky.

I have had the opportunity to drive through the wonderful State of Kentucky and I have seen some wonderful horse ranches and suspect that perhaps the families there live above the 130 percent of the poverty line. I suspect they can probably very likely afford to pay for their own children's lunches.

So while we want to leave intact the availability of lunches for these poor youngsters, there is again the reduced-price lunches for those families who make between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty line and they get a reduced price.

Then there are the students whose families make 185 percent of the poverty line who are classified as paid, but still receive 25 cents subsidy and 10 cents commodity subsidy.

I do not even want to take the opportunity away from these youngsters. But where can we draw the line? How high should a family income be while they still qualify for some subsidies for their youngsters' school lunch?

Obviously, we can take a look at the Members of this House. We all make a rather substantial income. When this bill first came into our committee, I was shocked to realize something I did not know, both as a professor making around \$45,000 a year and then now as a Member of Congress making over \$70,000 a year. My four schoolchildren each receive a 35-cent subsidy for their lunch. I do not need that subsidy for my youngsters. I do not want that subsidy for my youngsters. I would prefer not to have the poor wage earner in America paying higher taxes to support a higher budget and higher spending levels so that mine can have what they do not need and what I am perfectly capable of providing them and others as well.

So we are talking here really about a situation that exists in the form of a negative income transfer from the poor to the rich. I do not think anybody in this House wants the continuation of that kind of transfer.

When we see those youngster walking through the hollows, we have to remember their mothers and their fathers are earning incomes and they are paying taxes and those taxes do indeed support the entire budget and support my youngsters' school lunches. I do not think that is fair and I think that point has been eloquently made.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to understand the gentleman's substitute. It would be to means test this extra cash subsidy, is it 250 percent of the poverty level, is that the gentleman's intent?

Mr. ARMEY. Right.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the cash subsidy would be paid, it would be only for those persons who earn less than 250 percent of the poverty level?

Mr. ARMEY. Right.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. If indeed a family makes 250 percent or more of the poverty level, the school would still get its 10 cents commodity bonus, but the individual student would not receive the 25 cents subsidy.

I think that is a fair place in which to draw the line, a place that concentrates the revenues, scarce as they are, in support of the youngsters who really need it the most and whose parents are least able to provide for them a paid lunch in part or in whole.

I would suspect that perhaps members of the committee on the other side might find this a good compromise between the Bartlett position and their own and I would hope they would accept it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the substitute and the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as Alice observed somewhere during the proceedings after she went through the looking glass, "It gets curiously and curiously."

The gentleman said that he was going to give us an amendment that was less controversial. How an amendment that would require the parents of every public school child in the country to make a disclosure of their family income to the school if it operated a school lunch program could be less controversial than anything else that has been suggested on this floor is beyond me.

Now, it is apparent from the gentleman's plaintive cry for redirecting resources from "the rich to the poor" that he woefully lacks a knowledge of how the program works and how it is supported at the local school district level. When we talk about school children leaving the program, that will not be done because they or their parents will voluntarily leave. We talk about programs that will close up if you put these kinds of limitations on and turn this into a poverty program.

It really startles me that the gentleman from Texas persists in his efforts after all of these years of this program to turn this into a poverty program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has explained the history of it. The gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, has explained it.

This was not a poverty program. It was adopted in 1946 and it said in that bill that it was a program to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children. It did not say poor children, rich children, middle class, it said children.

Now, why did they do something that strange? The why is very simple. Epidemiologists became fascinated with where and what numbers of people were disclosed during the period of the maximum draft during World War II who could not pass a basic physical to serve in any of our armed services for conditions that clearly were being identified by medical authorities as being the fault of bad nutrition during their formative years.

Congress said we might have to fight another war. They were prophetic, because just 5 years later we were back in another war with the draft going again and they said:

We are not going to let this happen to this country again. At least we are going to try to interrupt the problem of bad nutrition for the children in these schools by intercepting them and use the school system as a device for that and provide at least some basic nutrition for all these children and see what happens.

□ 1510

Since 1946, the program has worked very well.

In 1962, one of my liberal colleagues, in 1962, a gentleman who then was characterized as a very liberal person for this side, instead of treating all of the children the same said let us now have a reduced-price lunch program, and that is when the reduced price came in.

I get the impression from some people who talk about this legislation that they think it was something they did during the poverty program that got expanded to the middle class. It got concentrated within the program in terms of how much they paid to the school for their lunch, but never in how much was paid to the school to operate the program. Never at any time since 1946, except for a short period of time when the unfortunate result of Gramm-Latta was to produce a short period of reduction in this money, have we ever had in the program a time when we attacked the money that goes to the school to maintain the program.

Here is where the lack of understanding of the program comes in. You can stand on this floor and plead for the poor people all you want, and how you want to help the poor kids. But if you give them a chit or a token for a meal, and there is no lunch program at the school they attend to spend it, you have given them nothing. They cannot take it to McDonald's. They cannot take it down to the local greasy spoon. They cannot cash it in. It has no value to them.

If you want to offer a free or reduced priced lunch to the low-income children, there has to be a lunch provided in that school, that day, that they can stand in line to get and pay the free or reduced price for.

That is what it all comes down to. Crassly put, if the nonpoor children are not involved in the program, commonsense tells you that what happened in the short period of Gramm-Latta repeats itself, that school districts faced with finding other resources in times of great scarcity at the local school district level will not be able to find money to keep the lunchroom open. So the people, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] referred to in his school, that has only 20 percent poor children, those 20 percent get zilch. The children who can afford it will find an alternative way to get meals.

I urge we reject both the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Army amendment which would target assistance to the students from the lower and middle class and end the cash subsidy to those families which make over 250 percent of the poverty level.

I have seen the face of hunger in this country. Many Members have seen the face of hunger. I have seen children in the last several years still suffering from diseases resulting from malnutrition. There is deep, biting, searing hunger in this Nation for many, and we do not meet our responsibility to promote the general welfare unless we address that problem. The problem has grown more acute, despite opposing contentions, and it is time to rededicate ourselves to rectifying this situation.

The Army amendment proposes to add, a much-needed component of fairness to the School Lunch Program. Is it fair to end a cash subsidy for targeted groups and, therefore, cut millions of poor and middle-income children from the program? For every penny cut, there is a 1-percent decline in those that participate in the program. Without these paying students participating, the basic infrastructure of the School Lunch Program is lost. If cuts are made, many lunch programs will cease and all children in the community, including poor children, lose access to the National School Lunch Program.

H.R. 7, as it now stands, is fiscally responsible. It is in full conformity with the House budget resolution. There is no argument with the contention that good health is essential for the well-being of our families. Our children presently in the School Lunch Program have benefited because we have recognized the need for the continued Federal role in addressing hunger and food assistance. Those of us in the Congress must take the lead in insuring that the needs of our citizens are met. Let us not retreat from this commitment. Accordingly, let us show a strong support for this commitment and vote against the Army amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETRI TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETRI to the amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: Page 1, line 14, strike out "and".

Page 1 line 17, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "and".

Page 1, after line 17, insert the following: (3) at the end of subsection (e) by inserting the following new sentence: "Commodity assistance shall be available for all lunches served in schools participating in the school lunch program."

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, this really just splits the cake in half so far as this amendment is concerned by re-

storing to the program in the case of all meals offered through the School Lunch Program participation in the Commodity Program.

Some of these commodities, of course, are purchased in the commercial market. Others are available because they are surplus commodities such as are in Government warehouses. In any event, those commodities, if they were not distributed to school children, would end up being wasted.

It seems to me that that, as a result, would not be a savings. It would simply move the cost in a different direction, and we can help young people by distributing this food. And it seems to me as a result that we should continue to allow the Commodity Program purchases and the distributions to continue for all people regardless of whether they are above or below the poverty line.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. By your amendment, do I understand then we would keep in the commodity subsidy for all students, irrespective of the income level, and that indeed the school lunch program itself would then have a 22½-cent commodity subsidy for even the students who pay for their own lunch?

Mr. PETRI. That is correct. That subsidy of 21½ cents or whatever the amount would be of the subsidy would apply for the rich student and the poor student. So long as they ate in that cafeteria, the school would get that money.

Mr. ARMEY. I think the gentleman has crafted a very good amendment here, and if I might comment on it, that subsidy to the school program should, I think, in that case alleviate some of the concerns about the extent to which the programs may be jeopardized by those students who may choose to drop out. And indeed, if I could comment on that, in the experience that we had from 1981 to 1985, I do not believe the dropout experience was all that much. Indeed, it was not so totally related to the increased costs. We had an enrollment decline and that had a big impact on the dropout. We had high-tuition school exclusion, and we had the net effect of verification.

The fact of the matter is many, many higher-income Americans, middle- and higher-income American, when asked to verify that they need it, simply say no, I do not need it, I will not fill out the verification and decide that instead certainly they will pay for their youngster's lunch, because indeed they do not need it. They do not choose it.

So, in fact, the projections were for a decline and indeed we had a greater enrollment than what was projected.

So we really have not experienced, in fact, that much of a decline, jeopardizing programs.

The gentleman would certainly add insurance to the stability of the program and to the youngsters' ability to have the program in place so they could have their lunch. I would be more than happy to accept the gentleman's amendment in light of your further observation that indeed through other programs we buy the commodities anyway, and it is a question of warehousing them or distributing them to school programs. I think it is a good amendment and I commend you for offering it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is getting more and more confused. I am not quite sure where to start.

We are now being told that it is all right to accept the tax dollars to go out and buy commodities to distribute it to the paying customers. But it is not all right to give them cash, because that is just what we would do if we were to accept this amendment.

Keep in mind, the 10-cent bonus commodities are truly surplus. But I will guarantee that an awful lot of the 11 cent plus are not surplus. We go out and purchase them because we think it enhances—I am not sure why we do it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and I have been trying to get away from this purchase of commodities and give them the cash, and let them do it back in their own District. But that is what we do.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is talking me out of accepting the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Well I think I should. I think you should be consistent. I think if you are saying that somehow or other we should not try to keep the program going because we are giving tax dollars to people who can afford to pay for the lunch themselves, then you should not accept the gentleman's amendment, because his amendment does take tax dollars and gives those tax dollars to those who could afford to pay for their lunch, according to you, because we go out and buy, not necessarily surplus commodities, but we go out and buy what we think we should be distributing. It may be a lot of hamburger and that is good for your State.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman again will yield, I might make the point though, the distinction is that it is the commodity subsidy to the program as opposed to the cash subsidy.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, and all I am saying is what is the difference.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding because I want to help clarify this issue. First of all, I tend to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania's general philosophy that if we are going to cut out 12½ cent cash commodities, 12½ cent cash subsidies, either way you are frankly going to decimate the program. I think the amendment is simply too strong and devastating from that perspective.

But there is a justification for commodity subsidy as opposed to cash subsidy, and if you talk to any of your school administrators about your school lunch programs they will tell you, as mine have consistently told me, please do not cut out the commodities subsidies because frankly, the Federal Government buying in essence surplus commodities at high-volume rates can provide a heck of a lot more commodity for the dollar than we in our local school districts can taking that same amount of dollar and going out and then purchasing it.

Mr. GOODLING. I will take back my time. It is not often that we disagree, but that is not correct.

In the bonus commodities, you get butter, cheese, cheese mozzarella, cheese processed, honey, milk, nonfat dry, rice, milk, all surpluses, and that is a bonus.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. GOODLING. However, what the gentleman is talking about in his amendment, he is not touching bonuses.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. GOODLING. He is talking about those that we go out and purchase, that are not necessarily surpluses, in most cases are not surpluses. And we go out and buy those commodities.

But let me tell you what your school food services people, and they are beginning to have a change of heart on this whole thing, say. Originally, they thought that it was the best to get all and, of course, they wanted all. But let me tell you what happens.

When we go out and we buy the commodity, it means first of all they do not buy that commodity in their local district or where they are probably going to get better quality. The cost involved is on the Federal level. We buy it, we store it, we ship it, we then ship it to the State. The State then stores it. The State then pays the freight to get it onto the school district. The school district then, lo and behold, in many instances, has to send it back out and have it processed.

Now if you can show me how anything can be more expensive than that

whole thing, I do not know. But that is not the point that I am arguing.

The point I am arguing, if you have a philosophy, which I understand the two gentleman from Texas have, a philosophy that says you do not try to save the school lunch program, that that is not important because we know that you have to make sure that the paying customer is participating in order to keep that national school lunch program, then you have to be consistent. Then you do not take tax dollars in cash, or you do not take tax dollars in commodities. Give them their bonus commodities, but, you see, then we will get those who make \$70,000 and above. They seem to know how, the group who is a family of four, and I know some lovely families of four. I have one of my own and my whip has one. But let me tell you, a family of four, when you are talking about \$18,000, is a little bit different than a family of four when you are talking about \$70,000.

I get into this argument all of the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLING. All I am trying to point out to you in relationship to your accepting this amendment is that it is not consistent with your philosophy, because we use tax dollars to buy those commodities in order to distribute them, many of which are not surplus commodities. All bonuses are surpluses, but those other commodities are not.

But let me get back to some of the other issues in relation to the gentleman's amendment. It is difficult to stand up and argue that hey, somehow or other there should not be any tax dollars going to \$27,000 families of four and above. That is difficult to argue.

But let me point out several things in relationship to the gentleman's amendment. First of all, in your "Dear Colleague," I guess the thing that scares me most about your amendment is that we really do not have any statistics. We really have no way of knowing. In your "Dear Colleague," you say that there will be people who will get up and say that you are going to devastate the program in relationship to free and reduced-price youngsters, and that is not so. That is the way you say in your amendment.

All I say is I do not have any statistics. You may be right. We never had this before. I have no statistics to prove whether you are right or whether you are wrong.

I do know that every time you reduce your reimbursement by 1 cent to the paying customer, you lose 1 percent of the participants in the school

lunch program. I do know that after reconciliation in 1981 we lost 3 million students. Why? In most instances because the schools dropped the national school lunch program. That eliminated them from having to worry about free- and reduced-priced meals.

One other question and concern that I have. I am not quite sure how this works. You now added a fourth tier.

□ 1525

I am assuming now that everyone in your school district, in my case it will be most everyone with one or two school districts excepted, will have to bring in some kind of verification. In other words, in order for the school district to get the reimbursement, they will have to prove to the Secretary that, as a matter of fact, those people are not making more than \$27,000.

I assume that is what the gentleman is saying.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By request of Mr. ARMEY and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to address the question of my philosophy. My philosophy is very simple in this case: Yes, I want to see the School Lunch Program for the youngsters who need it; yes, I understand we have to have a program in place; yes, I see a difference between commodities that are purchased and moved even if they are bought, purchased, and moved, the incremental cost for that is rather nominal for these few additional students; yes, I understand we do not want the poor families to be paying higher taxes to support a program that feeds the children of relatively wealthy families, at least upper and middle income families.

As far as the dropoff figures are concerned, and I do not know where the gentleman got these figures, but I do not find figures that say, from the Department of Agriculture, that there were 3 million. I find 2 million. We can quibble about these figures.

Mr. GOODLING. Taking back my time, I read from the gentleman from Texas' school lunch and child nutrition director, in 1981-82, after a 5½-cent reduction in reimbursement for paid lunches from the previous year:

Statewide participation decreased by 4 million paid lunches. This represented a loss in average daily participation of over 23,000 students. Can you imagine then what a 12-cent cut would do?

I think I can document those figures. In fact, I have them here and can show them to the gentleman. They are not my figures.

You know, we get figures from OMB, we get figures from the Agriculture Department. Those are usually tough to get.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, obviously we are going to have a conflict in figures. I think we need to go then to the principle. I again lay the principle on the table: Should the children and the parents of the children of the poor families in America be asked to pay taxes so that we can provide free lunch to the children of families who are making 250 percent or more of the poverty level? It is that kind of regressive transfer that is satisfactory to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GOODLING. Again, I want to make it clear that we do not have a subsidy for paying customers. That has been something that has been thrown around here year, after year, after year. The Congress of the United States, as was pointed out by Mr. Ford, never talked about poor children; we never talked about free and reduced when they introduced the legislation. They talked about poor nutrition. They said it ought to do something about poor nutrition. We had to have a hammer over the heads of the local districts. They said that hammer was that if you are going to get reimbursement, you must participate in the national School Lunch Program. If you do not participate, you do not have to feed anybody. Many school districts after 1981 did just exactly that. So there are an awful lot of people.

My statistics that I was reciting come from the Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress. They might even be more legitimate than from the Agriculture Department.

They indicated that in 1981 there were 26 million. They indicated that in 1982 there were 23 million. Now, if my arithmetic is correct, that is 3 million.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, again, I would hope that we would oppose the amendment and the substitute and the amendment thereto. I think Mr. GOODLING has pointed out the inconsistencies in the amendment to the substitute. But let me suggest to you that the substitute and the previous amendment, the underlying amendment, are simply here

to gut the program. It is as if we have learned nothing since 1981. The evidence is clear and the evidence is convincing that when we cut the cash subsidy to the paid lunch programs under some notion that somehow we were providing an unjustified subsidy, both paid and poor children dropped out of the program. The paying children have started to come back, but the poor children have stayed away. Then when you take in the substitute, it is not the notion that somehow this is fairness and equity. We know about this kind of documentation. The Reagan administration ran a pilot program among poor children, among the free lunch programs. And they found out that the vast majority of their savings did not come from waste, fraud, and abuse but came from the legitimately qualified poor children who dropped out because their parents were intimidated or would not send the verification and the documentation to those school districts, and about 7 percent of the children dropped out of that program.

If you extrapolate that nationwide, you are talking about almost 1 million children who would continue to drop out because of that kind of intimidation. This amendment is designed for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to gut this program.

That is what the substitute does. The amendment, the underlying amendment that deals with taking away the paid meal, I will tell you what else it does. It is a foolish amendment, because if you have so much concern for poor children, I assume you would be back here suggesting that if the local districts did not feed these poor children that we should. But I have not seen anybody suggest that in an amendment to cushion those districts or to cushion those poor children. The fact of the matter is, as Mr. GOODLING pointed out, numerous districts simply made the decision to close down the lunch program for poor children; rich or poor, they closed down the program and poor children had nowhere else to go.

Let us also understand something, that in many instances not only are the poor children a minority within the power structure of the school district, they happen to be minority children with a minority in the power structure of the school districts. And a good number of school districts around this country have decided they are not going to feed poor children, or black children, or Hispanic children, or other minorities. They simply decided politically they will take their money and they will do something else with it.

That is why we keep paying children in the School Meals Program. I had an amendment several years ago to do exactly what you wanted to do. But what became clear was that, if those chil-

dren fled the program, school districts would make a political decision which would disenfranchise poor children from the right to have nutrition, from the right to have an equal opportunity to learn and a nutritional balance so they could do that.

That is the history of this program, and we ought not to deny it. We ought not to deny that that is the decision that local districts have made each and every time. They did not make the decision, "Oh, we will run a little program over here for the poor children, we will run a nice program, we will make sure that happens." They dropped them. They dropped them like a hot potato. Why? Because we cut 5 cents.

Now we are talking about cutting 12 cents. And when we get done cutting the 12 cents, we are taking the program where Mr. BARTLETT just had an amendment to ask for a simplification study, and we are going to make it more complicated. So we are not just going to punish the poor children, we are not just going to punish the rich children, we are going to punish the school districts now, because they are going to have to go through a program that this administration has already repudiated.

Do you start to get the drift of my conversation here? These amendments to the substitute are just flawed on their face. They have been tried the entire 10 years I have been in the committee. We have been over this ground, and each and every time the detriment has run to the poor children of this Nation, the very children that this administration tried to suggest that they cared about in terms of the safety net. This is the untying of the safety net, this is the one that is going to allow an awful lot of children who have nowhere else to go for half of their daily requirements in terms of nutrition, they are going to go right through this net and hit the ground. And I've got news for you, not one of you is going to come forward and suggest that we augment the budget to pick those children up and to feed them. The school districts that have 10 or 20 percent of these children in their school districts are not going to do it, because the politics of this Nation at the moment are elsewhere. So you can join up and throw these children to the ground or you can stick with the committee bill and understand that this is how we pay the overhead.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Let me tell you that these paying children contribute \$1 billion to this program. It would be far more expensive for you

to make the decision that we should feed poor children and only poor children because in fact the paying children are helping with the overhead and the totality of the costs of this program. So we have an amendment that, if you look at it from the bottom, the top, or sideways, it makes no sense, and the Congress ought to reject it.

We have been over this ground, we have tried these test programs, we have had them from the Senate and the House. All of them, all of them have been a flop, except for one thing that they have done.

So open up your eyes, they have punished poor children. That has been the end result every time we have approached this subject.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line here is, whatever approach you take, these kinds of amendments get at the infrastructure that is necessary to be sure that a school lunch program is offered.

Mr. MILLER of California. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BOLAND and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. That is exactly the point. There is a certain cost for a district to maintain the overhead and the integrity of the program, and if we rip out part of that cost there is no evidence that it is being made up elsewhere.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman further yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman this is the mechanism that we have used over time to ensure that the School Lunch Program is in place.

Mr. MILLER of California. Exactly.

Mr. PENNY. Any dismantling of this funding is going to make it less likely that school lunch programs will be in existence. So it is not fair to make an argument that somehow we are only affecting wealthy students or wealthy families by making this kind of a reduction, but you are in fact voting to eliminate programs, and when you eliminate programs you are denying eligibility to a decent lunch to poor children across America. I oppose the amendment and speak in support of the committee provisions.

Mr. MILLER of California. Let me just say to my colleague that he is ab-

solutely on point. You know, the difference between rich and poor is that the rich people have a lot of alternatives. If my son does not get a school lunch, he can go to Burger King or McDonalds, or we can pack him a lunch, or I can take him out to lunch. He has a zillion alternatives.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Poor children do not have alternatives. Because the majority of the poor people, working poor people who are trying to stay in the marketplace, they run out of food at the end of the month, they run out of food at the end of the week. They do not have the alternative that the Miller boys have. So the people who are being punished, as you point out, each and every time we have done this, the program has been eliminated and the poor children have suffered because there is no alternative.

You know, we are going to have the agriculture bill up here, and not everyone in that program is going to be a poor, bankrupt farmer. You have to put together the coalition. In this case, this is the only way we can maintain the program. To do less than this is to be more expensive.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that when we look at the trends among children in this Nation and if we look at the information and data provided by Mr. MILLER earlier, when we talk about 14 million or 22.4 percent of all the children in this Nation who are living below the poverty level, we know we are addressing the nutrition program today. But we ought to even be about the business of addressing the real problem that children are faced with, and this just happens to be one of them. If we cut this nutrition program or cut the cash payments to the nutrition program, we will be doing nothing but adding on to the additional 1 million or 1.5 million children who would be suffering below the poverty level.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in favor of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the House has struggled with this section of the bill. I think we have struggled with it, with three different proposals, any one of which would have an improvement over the way and the philosophy that

the program is run now. I have listened carefully to the debate. Some have said that somehow the School Lunch Program is not or should not be a poverty program. I would contend that the American people I do not think agree with that, that the School Lunch Program should provide for school lunches and in some cases school breakfasts for low-income children who otherwise would be hungry. Others have said that either my original amendment passes, or if the gentleman's substitute passes, somehow that would mean a price increase for schoolchildren in paying for their lunch. Mr. Chairman, it would mean a price increase for schoolchildren who are not poor perhaps; perhaps it would mean that your children and mine would be required to pay \$1 for a school lunch that costs \$1. It has been said that the paid lunches, that is of the nonneedy students, contribute \$1 billion a year to the cost of running the program.

The fact is that is not precisely so. Those children pay \$1 billion approximately to purchase their lunches. The only difficulty is, the Federal taxpayers pay another \$250 million for those same lunches for those same schoolchildren who are not needy.

□ 1540

It comes down to a question of philosophy; whether the Army amendment is accepted, or my amendment is accepted, it comes down to the question of, do we want to continue to pay 12 cents in cash, collected from all of the taxpayers, rich and poor alike, to subsidize lunches for children who are not poor.

Now, there are a lot of ways to eliminate that. We can eliminate it, as my amendment does; or we can, as the gentleman from Texas has suggested, we could say, OK, we will subsidize that 12 cents per lunch only for those children who are from families of 250 percent over the poverty level.

Now, would that require everyone to fill out a form? No. Or an application or statement of income? It would only say that those children who are eligible for that subsidy simply be required to do what all the other children do who are eligible for a subsidy; and to say and to state their income; no additional paperwork other than what is in the program right now.

Now, there are a lot of ways to control costs in the School Lunch Program. I have offered five amendments, many of which came from the committee and many of which came originally from the ranking Republican member of the committee; either at the budget committee or in the full committee.

In all of them there is an objection to it on this basis or an objection to it on that basis. The bottom line comes down to, the program is, I think, unintentionally, by this Congress, includ-

ing current law and H.R. 7, the program will increase in its cost at approximately 6 to 7 percent a year assuming the same number of recipients. That is feeding no additional low-income children.

So somehow, whether it is the committee or the Congress or the full House, or at some point in the program, if we are going to save the School Lunch Program for the entire Nation, we are going to have to make some modest reforms so we can control its cost.

Now, someone has said from time to time that somehow all of these amendments, all they do is gut the program or eliminate the program. In fact, amendments like this may well be the savior of the program, because of House of Representatives passed a bill last year that also went nowhere, and perhaps if we continue to pass unrealistic legislation that makes changes such as in the 6-cents School Breakfast Program that need to be made, but if we do not adjust the cost, and, Mr. Chairman, the School Lunch Program will continue to become an anachronism; we will not get any changes made either here or in the other body, or finally into law.

So I would suggest that in many ways, it is those of us who are trying to make some reforms to turn the focus of the School Lunch Program to assisting low incomes students that will ultimately save the program.

Mr. LOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] in supporting the Army amendment. I do not know the details of the School Lunch-Child Nutrition Program that those gentlemen that serve on the committee know; I have got a lot of questions about it, and I have been listening to some of the debate here.

I am certainly very interested in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has to say, but the fact remains.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTLETT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LOTT. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, under this program clearly the cost is going to go up year after year. I do not think there is any doubt about that, and I cannot support that type of increase with the questions I have about the way some of the program is run.

The second part is, clearly there are some people that are entitled or eligible for the school lunch program that are not in the poverty level. That is

what the gentleman from Texas is trying to get at.

I cannot defend to my constituents how the majority of the children in my hometown, a blue collar town, shipyard workers, that type of person; the majority of their children would be eligible for the School Lunch Program even though they could pay for those lunches unless there is some limitation.

Maybe this is not the best way to do it, but I do know this; there is general dissatisfaction with the fact that the School Lunch Program is supposed to be targeted, I thought, for poor children, is as a matter of fact also going to children in the moderate-income level almost.

Certainly, at 250 percent of poverty level is not too much to ask for. There must be some restrictions. Let us make sure the program is aimed at the children that are genuinely in need of the school lunch program, and that are generally poor children and not allow it to continue to go to those that are not needy.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thought we had just accepted, 30 minutes ago now, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas to simplify the program.

If there has been any confusion and chaos introduced, it seems to me that it has been in the last 30 minutes. The situation is, we have an attempt to try to correct or to sanitize one amendment after the other.

Mr. ARMEY attempted to sanitize Mr. BARTLETT's amendment, which is devastating and flawed; then Mr. PETRI comes in and tries to purify Mr. ARMEY's amendment.

So we have a series of attempts to rewrite this bill based on ad hoc reasoning on the floor of the House, which I submit is not the way we should be legislating. Our legislation should be based on testimony by expert witnesses, committee deliberations, analyzing and reviewing for the purposes of improvement legislation within the committee is jurisdiction and then by the Members from the various committees that have had some experience in this field, and understand the devastating effect that the original amendment would have on this program. Certainly Mr. ARMEY, in trying to correct it commits, in my opinion, the same mistake; to say that \$27,000 income of a family today is a high income bracket does not square with the facts of life.

Now, obviously, it sounds good; we might attempt to give it some consideration, but it has been stated over and over again that when you do away with the paying students, you affect the infrastructure of the program. You destroy the program because you make it less economical; it is much

harder to operate; and once you destroy the program, you destroy it not only for the wealthy, the so-called wealthy who have other alternatives, but you also destroy it for the poor people; for the poor children, children who come from the lower socio-economic level of our society.

Now, we already have three classes that we deal with, which is unfortunate. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] said, this program originated in 1946; it was not originated as a welfare program; even the students who pay reduced amounts or do not pay at all was an issue that came up in the 1960's and we went in that direction.

We now have three classes: The poor, those who are half-rich and then those who are supposed to be rich. Now this amendment would introduce those who are richer than the rich.

So we are beginning to stratify the program and to tell children who come to American schools that you are now going to be identified in terms of the homes from which you come.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] says: Well, it is easy; just eliminate those \$27,000 and over. How do you eliminate them? You have to have some verification, and in doing so, you have to ask everybody, What is your income? You cannot eliminate them unless you can identify them. Nobody is going to come forward and volunteer.

So it introduces a system of documentation, of verification in which you have to find some way in this system to require some documentation of verification from everybody.

Now, are you going to ask the wealthy to turn their tax forms over? How can their financial status be verified? Are you going to simply accept the fact that everybody is truthful and everybody is going to come forward and volunteer.

So it introduces more confusion, chaos, and in my opinion, a very un-American system into American education.

I am sure that if I had introduced the Arme amendment to begin with, Mr. ARMEY might have looked at me and said, "You are introducing an element of socialization. You are going to take from the rich and you are going to give to the poor. You are going to redistribute the wealth in America."

Well, I do not think that is what he intended to do, but it sounds like he is attempting to do that in this program, and this creates a very confusing, chaotic situation, when it really is not.

So the Basic issue is this: Do the Members really support the program? We know that there are some reforms that could be made; and some have been made, but this is not the way to do it.

□ 1550

Those of us, let us say, in this House who have children in public schools, are we to say that our children are not, in a sense, adequately supported by us? Those who have high incomes certainly are going to pay much more toward public education. So it is not true that they are getting a free ride. None of us will be getting a free ride. Those of us who are perhaps fortunate to have high incomes certainly are paying much more of our income proportionately than are the poor who get the reduced-price or free lunches. So we are paying. We are paying more in State taxes, we are paying more in property taxes, and so forth. So it is not true that there is a free ride even for those in the so-called high-income brackets.

So I think that we should look upon this program as it was looked upon when it was originated in 1946, as a national policy. It is a national policy of this Nation to provide nutrition, to provide a healthy body for an individual who has a capacity for learning. That is a national policy. If a person is hungry, there is not much motivation to do anything else. We are not going to gut these nutrition programs by introducing these novel ideas that mean well but unfortunately have a very disastrous consequence. I ask the body to reject all three amendments because it is merely an attempt to rearrange the decks on the Titanic. Neither one adds anything that has not been thought of before. I think the overall effect of them, even as they are attempting to amend them, would be devastating to the program.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, again we are at one of those places where it appears as though there is no length to which this House will not go to spend money, because literally what we are talking about here in the Arme amendment and the Petri amendment that is attached to it is the question of whether or not the poor should pay taxes to fund a subsidy to the rich. That is what this is all about. The Arme amendment says that people making more than \$27,000 a year should not receive a subsidy from the taxpayer, and the Petri amendment says, yes, and particularly it should not be a cash subsidy. In other words, the poor should not have to pay taxes in order to give additional cash through the Government to the rich.

And what do we hear argued here on the House floor? "Well, of course they should. Why, the rich pay a lot of additional in taxes. There are all kinds of reasons why the poor ought to give some of this to the rich. And forget about the deficit, my friends. Forget about the fact that we have got \$200

billion worth of deficit. Of course, in that deficit year, we ought to fund the rich. We ought to be giving as much as possible to the rich in this program."

I just heard arguments here a little while ago talking about the poor, how this program ought to be directed toward the poor. I agree with that. But how you can come 180 degrees now and oppose the Arney amendment that suggests all the money ought to go toward the poor and we ought to stop subsidizing the rich is beyond me. But that is exactly what we are doing. If you do not accept the Arney amendment, what you are suggesting is that the taxpayers of this country ought to subsidize the children of the \$50,000 a year lawyer who sends his kids to the public schools, that they ought to be subsidizing the children of the \$75,000 a year Congressman who sends his kids to public school, that they ought to be subsidizing the \$100,000 a year doctor who sends his kids to the public school, that they ought to be subsidizing David Rockefeller's kids, or whoever is out there; if they are going to the public schools, by golly, the \$17,000 a year working family in this country ought to subsidize them.

That is just terrible. That is rotten government. And it is particularly rotten government at a time when you have got multibillion dollar deficits. And I think it is high time that we understand that that is indeed a real problem. The deficit problem is real. Here is a chance to save \$188 million and do so by saying we are not going to subsidize the rich out of taxpayer's money. That is precisely what you are able to do if you vote for the Arney amendment and the Petri amendment. We will stop subsidizing the rich with taxpayers' money, we will save a little money on the deficit, and we will reserve the program for the poor. If you vote differently, then all I have got to say is, we will find any way here to spend the money, because that is precisely what we are going to be doing, we are going to be spending \$188 million to give the rich additional subsidies.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the substitute and the amendment.

There is an old saying, "Don't let your mouth write a check that your butt can't cash."

I think there is one particular thing we should all be discussing here. I have never seen so many emotional speakers on the floor of the House when we start talking about children, nutrition, poverty, educational opportunity, hunger, rights. But when we start talking about foreign aid and when we start talking about the defense areas, I never hear anybody rise and discuss the deficit and busting the bank, the Treasury.

Now, if you listened to the last impassioned speaker—and I certainly respect his ability to orate and articulate—I would like to say this: If you were not apprised of the issue, you might be dissuaded from a position of common sense. Here is the position we are dealing with: At bottom here and at stake is the fact that somewhere in the Halls of this Congress the Members here took at issue educational opportunity and that it be fair and equal for all. What happened in 1981 is they emasculated this particular program, and if this particular bill goes without any amendments, it will restore less than 25 percent of those cuts made in 1981.

Now, let us look at \$188 million. And let us look to maybe next week, when you will be on the floor with \$10 billion additional for those \$700 toilet seats.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I will not yield at this time. I would like to maintain my time to make my point. I believe there has been an adequate time to discuss the particular amendment that has been offered and the substitutes.

My position is strictly this: This committee has taken an endless amount of time in deliberating the issues, and since 1946 this particular Congress has steadfastly offered and insured educational opportunity and to make sure that hungry kids just do not learn, that that would be stricken, perhaps, in the greatest nation of all. They have risen to a point when in 1981 we took a big step backward.

Now, two wrongs are not going to make a right. I believe the gentleman here is well qualified. He understands the educational position. But there is a bottom at the core of this, a philosophical difference. I am not so sure we are really hearing the truthful messages here, that we are now being fragmented on issues that are not really at the core.

So let us not be confusing poverty with the positions that are so-called manifest at this point on the other side.

My position is right to the point. I think that the chairman of this committee, the members of this committee, has reviewed all of these factors. They have taken on probably the best measure they possibly can to ensure an equal educational opportunity for all and no demagoguery is going to infringe upon that.

And, finally, to maybe restore the very dangerous acts that were taken in 1981.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment to my substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. I believe this debate has gone on

long enough. I think the point is clearly made. I think my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, made it very well. The question is: At what point do we draw the line?

Now, I did not define the poverty line. I understand that \$27,000 a year is not wealthy. But the poverty line is drawn, and I have said if you are going to 250 percent of that, then you ought to be able to pay that additional 12 cents on your youngster's lunch. I am not establishing a fourth category. I am putting a lid on the third category. I am saying there has got to be a place where we can draw a line in this country on spending, because if we cannot do that and if we cannot do it at 12 cents a day for the youngsters of the family that is making 250 percent of poverty, we cannot draw the line, then inflation goes out of control, spending is out of control, taxes are out of control, and those families out in the hollows of Kentucky who are having so much difficulty right now will be so far in debt trying to pay their taxes that they will not be able to buy the other two meals a day that their youngsters need.

We have to be very careful about that. When you substitute a paternalistic redistribution of income in America from the poor to the rich, then the victim is the truly needy in America, and I say that is not fair. I am asking the Members of this House, with me, to find a place where you can draw a line on spending, where you can draw a line on taxing, give the American wage-earner the right to keep the income they earn. That is a far better thing than taking it away from the poor and transferring it to the rich, as this program would do.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

With those statements, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a parliamentary inquiry, because, quite frankly, I am not sure where we are on this. But I suspect that where we are now is at a point where I might appropriately call for a vote on the Petri amendment to my substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is the first vote. The Committee will vote first on the Petri amendment to the Arney substitute for the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. If it is in order at this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield back the remainder of my time and ask for that vote.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the this substitute amendment or any amendment which would eliminate or reduce the cost subsidy for nonneedy students. As originally enacted in 1946, a major purpose of the National School Lunch Program was to enhance the nutri-

tion of the Nation's children. The program was developed as a public health and educational service and not as a welfare or income transfer program. The elimination or reduction of the current case subsidy for all school lunches would change this 40-year-old success story into another welfare program stratified by class and income. The cash subsidy is paid to the schools to support the basic infrastructure of the program for all students. If the subsidy is eliminated, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that 17,900 schools will be forced to end participation in the School Lunch Program. As a result over 5 million students will not have access to any type of School Lunch Program. On behalf of all children in the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia, where in the 1983-84 school year over 9 million meals were served under the National School Lunch Program, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and retain this important nutrition service.

Even J.R. Ewing, a constituent of the author of the amendment, would vote against this.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

My colleagues, this amendment, in large measure, and particularly the arguments of some in support of it, indicate to me a real—and I do not say this lightly—lack of understanding of how this program works, number 1, and, beyond that, how taxing policy in America works.

There has been some objection expressed in the well to a tax policy that appears to tax the poor so that rich kids can get reduced-price lunches. Well, to begin with, we do not tax the poor in this country, because the poor do not have enough income to tax. But let us say that the question is, Should we tax lower-middle-income kids in order that rich children have access to reasonably priced nutrition? The answer is yes, oh, sure, we should, because our taxing system is universal and it taxes the lower-middle-income family and the rich family, and under the genius of our tax system the rich family pays a lot more for lunch for lower-middle-income kids than the lower-middle-income family has to pay in taxes to feed the rich kids. You see, it is simple. And I think most Americans understand that. They understand that, of course, rich and lower-middle income should be taxed alike and that we should take money out of the Treasury to help pay for reasonably priced nutritional lunches for all kids, rich and poor alike.

So one needs to understand the genius of the American tax system.

And then another point I might offer my colleagues is this: This is a good business practice. Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have convinced many colleagues on my side of the aisle that we ought

to run this Government more like a business. Well, in this program we do. We use the reduced prices for the upper-middle-income kids as what American business calls a loss-leader item. We use it to get the other kids in the door. Without it, the other kids cannot get in the door because the program shuts down. Unless you have all of the kids coming in, many of them buying the lunches, even at a slightly reduced price for the well-off kids, you cannot keep the doors open. The best businesses in America use that theory. So we want to continue to use it for this program, which has become one of the shining examples of how our schools can do more than simply educate our children. They can check for their good health, they can provide them with good nutrition. And, yes, they can even provide us with our star center fielders or quarterbacks for our favorite sports teams. The schools can do a great deal. And one of the reasons they can do it, my friends, is because the American people have understood the genius of having our children well fed and the genius of a tax system that takes from lower middle, upper middle, and the rich alike, puts it in a pool and then takes the money and shares it with all of our children.

□ 1605

These amendments would begin to rupture that system, so I urge my colleagues to look very, very closely at these amendments. When you do, I hope you will join us in voting "no."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—174

Archer	Burton (IN)	Courter
Armey	Callahan	Craig
Badham	Campbell	Crane
Barnard	Carney	Daniel
Bartlett	Carper	Dannemeyer
Barton	Chandler	Daub
Bateman	Chappell	DeLay
Bennett	Chapple	DeWine
Bentley	Cheney	Dickinson
Bereuter	Clinger	DioGuardi
Billakis	Coats	Dorman (CA)
Bliley	Cobey	Dreier
Boulter	Coble	Duncan
Breaux	Coleman (MO)	Eckert (NY)
Broomfield	Combest	Edwards (OK)
Broyhill	Coughlin	Emerson

Fawell	Mack	Schaefer
Fiedler	Madigan	Schneider
Fields	Martin (IL)	Schuette
Franklin	Martin (NY)	Schulze
Frenzel	McCain	Sensenbrenner
Gallo	McCandless	Shaw
Gekas	McCollum	Shumway
Gingrich	McEwen	Shuster
Goodling	McGrath	Siljander
Gradison	McKernan	Skeen
Gregg	McMillan	Skelton
Gunderson	Meyers	Slaughter
Hansen	Michel	Smith (NE)
Hartnett	Miller (OH)	Smith (NH)
Hiler	Miller (WA)	Smith, Denny
Hillis	Mollinari	Smith, Robert
Holt	Monson	Snowe
Hopkins	Montgomery	Snyder
Huckaby	Moore	Solomon
Hughes	Moorhead	Spence
Hunter	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland
Hutto	Myers	Stenholm
Hyde	Nelson	Strang
Ireland	Nichols	Stump
Jeffords	Nielson	Sundquist
Johnson	O'Brien	Sweeney
Kasich	Oxley	Swindall
Kemp	Packard	Tauke
Kindness	Parris	Tauzin
Kolbe	Pashayan	Taylor
Lagomarsino	Petri	Thomas (CA)
Latta	Porter	Vander Jagt
Leach (IA)	Ray	Vucanovich
Leath (TX)	Regula	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Ritter	Weber
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Whitehurst
Livingston	Roemer	Whittaker
Loeffler	Rogers	Wolf
Lott	Roth	Wortley
Lowery (CA)	Rowland (CT)	Wylie
Lujan	Rudd	Young (FL)
Lungren	Saxton	Zschau

NOES—254

Ackerman	Derrick	Hatcher
Akaka	Dicks	Hawkins
Alexander	Dingell	Hayes
Anderson	Dixon	Hefner
Andrews	Donnelly	Hefstel
Annunzio	Dorgan (ND)	Hendon
Anthony	Dowdy	Henry
Applegate	Downey	Hertel
Aspin	Durbin	Horton
Atkins	Dwyer	Howard
AuCoin	Dymally	Hoyer
Barnes	Dyson	Hubbard
Bates	Early	Jacobs
Bedell	Eckart (OH)	Jenkins
Bellenson	Edgar	Jones (NC)
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Jones (OK)
Biaggi	English	Jones (TN)
Boehlert	Erdreich	Kanjorski
Boggs	Evans (IA)	Kaptur
Boland	Evans (IL)	Kastenmeier
Boner (TN)	Fascell	Kennelly
Bonior (MI)	Fazio	Kildee
Bonker	Feighan	Kleczka
Borski	Fish	Kolter
Bosco	Flippo	Kostmayer
Boucher	Florio	Kramer
Boxer	Foglietta	LaFalce
Brooks	Foley	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Ford (MI)	Lehman (CA)
Brown (CO)	Ford (TN)	Lehman (FL)
Bruce	Fowler	Leland
Bryant	Frank	Lent
Burton (CA)	Frost	Levin (MI)
Bustamante	Fuqua	Levine (CA)
Byron	Garcia	Lightfoot
Carr	Gaydos	Lipinski
Chapman	Gejdenson	Lloyd
Clay	Gephardt	Lowry (WA)
Coelho	Gibbons	Lukens
Coleman (TX)	Gilman	Lundine
Collins	Glickman	MacKay
Conte	Gonzalez	Manton
Conyers	Gordon	Markley
Cooper	Gray (IL)	Marlenee
Coyne	Gray (PA)	Martinez
Crockett	Grotberg	Matsui
Darden	Guarini	Mavroules
Daschle	Hall (OH)	Mazzoli
Davis	Hall, Ralph	McCloskey
de la Garza	Hamilton	McCurdy
Dellums	Hammerschmidt	McDade

McHugh	Ridge	Swift
McKinney	Rinaldo	Synar
Mica	Robinson	Tallon
Mikulski	Rodino	Thomas (GA)
Miller (CA)	Roe	Torres
Mineta	Rose	Torricelli
Mitchell	Rostenkowski	Towns
Moakley	Roukema	Trafficant
Mollohan	Rowland (GA)	Traxler
Moody	Roybal	Udall
Morrison (CT)	Russo	Valentine
Mrazek	Sabo	Vento
Murphy	Savage	Visclosky
Murtha	Scheuer	Volkmer
Natcher	Schroeder	Walgren
Neal	Schumer	Watkins
Nowak	Seiberling	Waxman
Oakar	Sharp	Weaver
Oberstar	Shelby	Weiss
Obey	Sikorski	Wheat
Olin	Sisisky	Whitley
Ortiz	Slattery	Whitten
Owens	Smith (FL)	Williams
Panetta	Smith (IA)	Wilson
Pease	Smith (NJ)	Wirth
Penny	Solarz	Wise
Pepper	Spratt	Wolpe
Perkins	St Germain	Wright
Pickle	Staggers	Wyden
Price	Stallings	Yates
Pursell	Stark	Yatron
Quillen	Stokes	Young (AK)
Reid	Stratton	Young (MO)
Richardson	Studds	

NOT VOTING—6

Addabbo	Green	Rahall
Bevill	Long	Rangel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Chair will advise the membership that their votes are being recorded. However, the device on the wall behind the Chair is currently inoperative.

The Chair will further inform the membership that if they wish to check for a certainty that their votes are being recorded, they may do so at the terminals on the floor. Their votes are being shown on those terminals.

□ 1625

Mr. EVANS of Iowa changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LEACH of Iowa, HUTTO, and CHAPPELL changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to what will be the procedure from now on as far as taking the votes is concerned. Obviously, there was a lot of confusion on the last vote. As we proceed to what we understand will be another recorded vote right after this vote, what will be the procedure for taking that vote and others behind it?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will be happy to answer the gentleman.

The question has been raised as to what the intention of the Chair is with regard to any further votes.

The vote tallying system is working; the displays on both sides in the Chamber and above the Speaker are not. However, Members can verify their votes either by putting their cards in any of the slots and seeing it reported back to them or by verifying their votes at any of the television screens on the computers in the back of the Chamber or at the various leadership desks.

It is the intention of the Chair to proceed with any further votes, and the Chair is informed that everything is being done to restore the display portion of the votes. The Chair would point out that on the last vote only six Members did not vote, which indicates that the membership has a clear idea of what the procedure is.

The second question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi is: Where are we in the parliamentary situation?

We have just defeated the Petri amendment to the Army substitute for the Bartlett amendment. The next vote in order will be on the Army substitute for the Bartlett amendment.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair for that clarification, and, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of learning the schedule for the balance of this week and for next week. There has been a lot of interest and concern about when recorded votes would occur on Monday of next week or other days of next week, and I believe the distinguished majority whip is ready now to make an official announcement on that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] has moved to strike the last word and is recognized for that purpose.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], so we can learn the schedule for the balance of this week and also for next week, with particular reference to the handling of the agriculture bill on Friday, Monday, and/or Thursday of next week.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it has been recently decided to amend the schedule for next week. First, let me say that we will continue with this bill tomorrow if it is not completed this evening, and we will then take up the Amtrak authorization legislation.

On Friday, it is our intention, subject to a rule being granted, to consider the rules on the Agriculture Act of 1985 and on the Arts and Humanities legislation. So there will be two rules on Friday. In addition to that, general debate on the farm bill will be taken on Friday.

On Monday, the House will meet to have general debate only on the Arts and Humanities legislation. There will be no substantive votes on Monday.

Mr. Chairman, we will also undertake suspensions on Tuesday, and votes will be postponed on suspensions, if any votes are ordered, until Thursday. So votes on suspensions considered on Tuesday will be taken on Thursday, and there will be amendments to the farm bill which will begin on Thursday. Members should be advised that we may be in rather late on Thursday.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, if I may ask a couple of questions to magnify a couple of points the gentleman made, we do expect to take up amendments and go perhaps late on Thursday, taking up amendments on the farm bill, although it may not even then be possible to complete the bill on Thursday; it will depend on how the debate goes and how the amendments go, is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. There will be a rule requested, I believe, that will place some limitation on the time for amendments.

Mr. LOTT. But the gentleman expects no votes whatsoever on Monday?

Mr. FOLEY. With the usual reservation that a procedural vote could be ordered, but no legislative votes would be taken on Monday, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Backing up further, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the distinguished majority whip this question: On Friday there could conceivably be a couple of votes on those rules?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes. There will be two rules considered on Friday subject to Rules Committee action, and those could result in two rollcall votes, one on each rule. No other amendments will be considered on Friday. General debate only on the farm bill will follow the consideration of the rules, and the House will adjourn at 3 o'clock.

Mr. LOTT. Finally, does the gentleman have any idea about the intentions of the Chair as to how late we will go tonight on this legislation?

Mr. FOLEY. The hope is to conclude the legislation tonight, and we are not yet in a position to advise the House on how late that might be. I would hope it would be earlier rather than later.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for that information, and I am glad we finally have it clarified. I think we have taken a week to reach this point.

Mr. FOLEY. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not think we would be going beyond 6 o'clock tonight.

Mr. LOTT. That would be very fine for tonight.

I am sorry that we could not make this announcement last Thursday, but that is the way things go. At least now

we know that we will not be having votes on Monday.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that information.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWIFT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 279, not voting 9, as follows:

(Roll No. 311)

AYES—146

Archer	Gallo	Moorhead
Arney	Gibbons	Myers
Badham	Gingrich	Nielson
Bartlett	Gradison	O'Brien
Barton	Green	Olin
Bateman	Gregg	Oxley
Bennett	Grotberg	Packard
Bentley	Hall, Ralph	Porter
Bereuter	Hansen	Ray
Billakis	Hartnett	Regula
Bliley	Hiller	Ritter
Boulter	Hillis	Roberts
Broomfield	Holt	Roemer
Brown (CO)	Hopkins	Rogers
Broyhill	Hunter	Roth
Burton (IN)	Hyde	Rouland (CT)
Byron	Ireland	Rudd
Callahan	Johnson	Saxton
Campbell	Jones (OK)	Schaefer
Carney	Kasich	Schulze
Chandler	Kemp	Sensenbrenner
Chappie	Kindness	Shaw
Cheney	Kolbe	Shumway
Coats	Kramer	Shuster
Cobey	Lagomarsino	Siljander
Coble	Latta	Skeen
Combest	Leath (TX)	Slaughter
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Courter	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NH)
Craig	Livingston	Smith, Denny
Crane	Loeffler	Snyder
Daniel	Lott	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Spence
Daub	Lujan	Stenholm
DeLay	Lungren	Strang
DeWine	Mack	Stump
Dickinson	Martin (IL)	Sundquist
DioGuardi	McCain	Sweeney
Dornan (CA)	McCandless	Swindall
Dreier	McColum	Tauzin
Duncan	McEwen	Taylor
Eckert (NY)	McMillan	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	Meyers	Vander Jagt
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Walker
Fawell	Miller (WA)	Whitehurst
Fiedler	Molinari	Whittaker
Fields	Monson	Wylie
Franklin	Montgomery	Zschau
Frenzel	Moore	

NOES—279

Ackerman	Beilenson	Brown (CA)
Akaka	Berman	Bruce
Alexander	Biaggi	Bryant
Anderson	Boehlert	Burton (CA)
Andrews	Boggs	Bustamante
Annunzio	Boland	Carper
Anthony	Boner (TN)	Carr
Applegate	Bonior (MI)	Chapman
Aspin	Bonker	Chappell
Atkins	Borski	Clay
AuCoin	Bosco	Clinger
Barnard	Boucher	Coelho
Barnes	Boxer	Coleman (MO)
Bates	Breaux	Coleman (TX)
Bedell	Brooks	Collins

Conte	Jenkins	Ridge
Conyers	Jones (NC)	Rinaldo
Cooper	Jones (TN)	Robinson
Coyne	Kanjorski	Rodino
Crockett	Kaptur	Roe
Darden	Kastenmeier	Rose
Daschle	Kennelly	Rostenkowski
Davis	Kildee	Roukema
de la Garza	Klecza	Rowland (GA)
Dellums	Kolter	Roybal
Derrick	Kostmayer	Russo
Dicks	LaFalce	Sabo
Dingell	Lantos	Savage
Dixon	Leach (IA)	Scheuer
Donnelly	Lehman (FL)	Schneider
Dorgan (ND)	Leland	Schroeder
Dowdy	Lent	Schuetter
Downey	Levin (MI)	Schumer
Durbin	Levine (CA)	Seiberling
Dwyer	Lightfoot	Sharp
Dymally	Lipinski	Shelby
Dyson	Lowry (WA)	Sikorski
Early	Lukens	Sisisky
Eckart (OH)	Lundine	Skelton
Edgar	MacKay	Slattery
Edwards (CA)	Madigan	Smith (FL)
English	Manton	Smith (IA)
Erdreich	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Evans (IA)	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Evans (IL)	Martin (NY)	Snowe
Fasell	Martinez	Solarz
Fazio	Matsui	Spratt
Feighan	Mavroules	St Germain
Fish	Mazzoli	Staggers
Flippo	McCloskey	Stallings
Florio	McCurdy	Stangeland
Foglietta	McDade	Stark
Foley	McGrath	Stokes
Ford (MI)	McHugh	Stratton
Ford (TN)	McKernan	Studds
Fowler	McKinney	Swift
Frank	Mica	Synar
Frost	Mikulski	Tallon
Fuqua	Miller (CA)	Tauke
Garcia	Mineta	Thomas (GA)
Gaydos	Mitchell	Torres
Gejdenson	Moakley	Torricelli
Gekas	Mollohan	Towns
Gephardt	Moody	Trafiacant
Gilman	Morrison (CT)	Traxler
Glickman	Morrison (WA)	Udall
Gonzalez	Mrazek	Valentine
Goodling	Murphy	Vento
Gordon	Murtha	Visclosky
Gray (IL)	Natcher	Volkmer
Gray (PA)	Neal	Vucanovich
Guarini	Nelson	Walgren
Gunderson	Nichols	Watkins
Hall (OH)	Nowak	Waxman
Hamilton	Oaker	Weaver
Hammerschmidt	Oberstar	Weber
Hatcher	Obey	Weiss
Hawkins	Ortiz	Wheat
Hayes	Owens	Whitley
Hefner	Panetta	Whitten
Heftel	Parris	Williams
Hendon	Pashayan	Wilson
Henry	Pease	Wirth
Hertel	Penny	Wise
Horton	Pepper	Wolf
Howard	Perkins	Wolpe
Hoyer	Petri	Wortley
Hubbard	Pickle	Wyden
Huckaby	Price	Yates
Hughes	Pursell	Yatron
Hutto	Quillen	Young (AK)
Jacobs	Reid	Young (FL)
Jeffords	Richardson	Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—9

Addabbo	Lloyd	Rahall
Bevill	Long	Rangel
Lehman (CA)	Michel	Wright

□ 1640

Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1655

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be open to amendment at any point, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 12. RESTORATION OF CERTAIN KINDERGARTENS TO SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM.

Section 3(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended in the first sentence immediately before "and (2)" by inserting "(except that the preceding limitation shall not apply to kindergarten programs in such schools)".

SEC. 13. ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO IMPROVE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM MEAL PATTERN.

(a) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(3) The Secretary shall increase by 6 cents the annually adjusted payment for each breakfast served under this Act and section 17 of the National School Lunch Act to assist States in improving the nutritional quality of such breakfasts, to the extent feasible."

(b) NUTRITION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall review and revise the nutrition requirements for meals served under the school breakfast program to improve the nutritional quality of such meals, taking into consideration both the findings of the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs and the need to provide increased flexibility in meal planning to local school food service authorities. Not later than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations to implement such revisions.

SEC. 14. EXTENSION OF OFFER VERSUS SERVE PROVISION TO THE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM.

Section 4(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(e)"; and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) At the option of the local school food authority, students in schools that participate in the school breakfast program under this Act may be allowed to refuse not more than one item of such breakfast which they do not intend to consume, and any such refusal of such offered food item shall not affect the full charge to the student for a breakfast meeting the requirements of this section or the amount of payments made under this Act to any such school for such breakfast."

SEC. 15. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES STUDY.

Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) The Secretary shall conduct a study of the allocation formula and procedures

under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Such study shall provide information on State costs and contributions for administrative expenses, as well as the merits of a State matching requirement. The Secretary shall submit a report of such study to the Congress, together with any recommendations, by January 31, 1986."

SEC. 16. COSTS FOR NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

"(4) 'Costs for nutrition services and administration' means costs that shall include, but not be limited to, costs for certification of eligibility of persons for participation in the program (including centrifuges, measuring boards, spectrophotometers, and scales used for such certification), food delivery, monitoring, nutrition education, outreach, startup costs, and general administration applicable to implementation of the program under this section, such as the cost of staff, warehouse facilities, transportation, insurance, developing and printing food instruments, and administration of State and local agency offices."

(b) CONFORMING CHANGES.—Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by striking out "administrative funds" each place it appears in subsections (f)(11), (h)(2), (h)(3), and (h)(4), and inserting in lieu thereof "funds for nutrition services and administration"; and

(2) by striking out "administrative costs" each place it appears in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "costs for nutrition services and administration".

SEC. 17. STATE ELIGIBILITY FOR WIC FUNDS.

Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended in subsection (c) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) A State shall be ineligible to participate in programs under this section if the Secretary determines that State or local sales taxes are collected within that State on purchases of food pursuant to this section."

SEC. 18. COORDINATION WITH AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM.

Section 17(f)(1)(K) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting "the aid to families with dependent children program," after "child abuse counseling."

SEC. 19. IMPROVING STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS.

Section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended in the second sentence by inserting "providing technical assistance to improve State agency administrative systems," after "health benefits,".

SEC. 20. PRIORITY FUNDS FOR WIC MIGRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) PRIORITY FUNDING.—Section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for programs under this section not less than nine-tenths of one percent shall be first available for services to eligible members of migrant populations. Such migrant services shall be provided in a manner consistent with a State's priority system for program participation."

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—To the extent possible, accountability for migrant services under section 17(g) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) shall be conducted under regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 21. PAPERWORK REDUCTION.

Section 17(h)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting at the end thereof "The Secretary shall limit any such documentation required under the preceding sentence to a minimal level."

SEC. 22. APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.

Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(a) by inserting "(1)" after "(i)"; and

(b) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as so designated) the following new paragraph:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for a full fiscal year under this section shall be apportioned in such manner as shall ensure that not less than 70 per centum of the total funds appropriated for such fiscal year are obligated or expended by July 1 of such fiscal year, except that such requirement shall not apply to any supplemental appropriations enacted after January 1 of such fiscal year or to any funds reallocated pursuant to paragraph (1)."

SEC. 23. EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

(a) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) (as so designated in section 22 of this Act) the following new paragraph:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, not more than 2.5 per centum of any State's allocation under this section for supplemental foods for any fiscal year may be expended by such State for expenses incurred under this section for supplemental foods during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the sums were appropriated."

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to appropriations made before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 24. NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) VACANCIES.—Section 17(k)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting at the end thereof "The Secretary shall fill any vacancy in the Council within ninety days."

(b) MEETINGS.—Section 17(k)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting immediately before the period "and shall ensure that the Council meets at least once every twelve months"; and

(2) by striking out the second sentence.

SEC. 25. STUDY OF CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"STUDY OF CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 21. The Secretary shall conduct a study of the effect on families of the school breakfast program, the child care food program, and other programs under this Act. Such study shall consider whether alternative nutrition delivery programs would strengthen families. The Secretary shall submit a report of such study to the Congress, together with any recommendations or proposals for legislation, by January 1, 1987."

SEC. 26. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN INCOME FOR PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY.

The Secretary may not make any change in the method of calculating income, as in effect on January 1, 1985, used to determine eligibility for free or reduced-price meals, food supplements, or other assistance under the National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which would result in any reduction in, or denial of, such assistance, except as specifically directed in an enactment of law. The limitation under this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be effective through fiscal year 1986.

SEC. 27. EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) EXTENSION.—Upon request to the Secretary of Agriculture, any school district receiving all cash or all letters of credit in lieu of commodities under the school lunch program on January 1, 1985, shall continue to receive all cash in lieu of commodities or all letters of credit in lieu of commodities through the school year ending June 30, 1987. Such school districts shall receive bonus commodities in the same manner as such commodities are made available to any other school district participating in the school lunch program.

(b) COMPENSATION.—

(1) Upon request of a participating school district (and after consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to accounting procedures used to determine any losses), the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide cash compensation, subject to the availability of funds, to a school district which was participating in the school lunch pilot project study on or before the date of the enactment of this Act for losses sustained by the district as a result of the alteration of the methodology used to conduct the study during the school year ending June 30, 1983.

(2) For purposes of this subsection the term "school lunch pilot project study" means the study provided for in the last proviso of the matter under the heading "CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS" in title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, and for other purposes", approved December 15, 1980 (94 Stat. 3113).

(3) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 28. NATIONAL DONATED COMMODITY PROCESSING PROGRAMS.

(a) REPROCESSING AGREEMENTS.—Whenever a commodity is made available without charge or credit under any nutrition program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall encourage consumption of such commodities through agreements with private companies under which the commodity is reprocessed into end food products for use by eligible recipient agencies. The expense of such reprocessing shall be paid by such eligible recipient agencies.

(b) SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS.—To be eligible to enter into any agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (a), a private company shall annually settle all accounts with the Secretary and any appropriate State agency regarding commodities processed under such an agreement.

SEC. 29. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS.—The National School Lunch Act is amended—

(1) in section 12(d) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture."; and

(2) by redesignating the second section 22 as "Sec. 23.".

(b) CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS.—The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) in section 4(a) by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services";

(2) in section 17(e)(2) by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services";

(3) in section 17(k) (1) and (2) by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services"; and

(4) in section 19(d) (2) and (3) by striking out "Health, Education, and Welfare" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Health and Human Services".

SEC. 30. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) GENERAL PROVISION.—Except as otherwise provided, the provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) The provisions of sections 4, 5, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

(2) The provisions of sections 9, 12, and 13 shall take effect July 1, 1985.

(3) The provisions of section 17 shall apply to a State beginning with the fiscal year which commences after the end of the first regular session of the State legislature following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) The provisions of section 28 shall take effect July 1, 1985 and shall not have effect after October 15, 1987.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAWKINS

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAWKINS: Page 18, strike out lines 17 through 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(2) The provisions of sections 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is only a technical amendment. It changes the effective date of the bill to October 1 rather than July 1 as some of the provisions did require.

I am offering this amendment at the request of the Budget Committee inasmuch as the budget resolution was adopted later than what we had anticipated. This brings the bill into complete compliance with the budget resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say how much I respect the chairman of the

committee and have enjoyed the opportunity to work with him on this and on other issues, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. I appreciate the generous remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Prevention Strategies Task Force of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 7, to extend and improve our Federal child nutrition programs.

Passage of this bill is an important step in addressing the continuing, serious problems of hunger, malnutrition, and inadequate nutrition faced by millions of needy children and their families. We know that these problems have not gone away. If left unattended or treated casually, the problems only increase, creating greater jeopardy for the healthy development of children and their families, and requiring more costly intervention later on.

The several programs included in H.R. 7 have made important contributions to the good nutrition and healthy development of the women and children lucky enough to participate in the program.

For example, we know that, without the School Breakfast Program, most of the children served by the program—the vast majority of whom are poor—would not eat breakfast. We also know that, because of the School Lunch Program, poor children have gotten one third of their recommended daily allowance of nutrients every school day. At the same time, the School Lunch Program has allowed for the provision of nutritional benefits to all students in participating schools.

My colleagues and I on the select committee have also had the opportunity to learn a great deal about the program benefits and cost effectiveness of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC]. Recently, the select committee reviewed the program for its staff report, "Opportunities for Success: Cost Effective Programs for Children," which cites the major research findings concerning WIC along with seven other children's programs.

WIC program participation has shown dramatic effects: It is consistently associated with reductions in the incidence of neonatal mortality, low birthweight and prematurity, and can result in savings of as much as \$3 in immediate hospital costs for every \$1 expended in the prenatal component of the program.

H.R. 7 continues and enhances these valuable child nutrition programs. The bill provides for a modest increase in funding, and we included the H.R. 7 funding levels in the budget resolution approved only a few weeks ago. The added small investment will allow us to maintain services and make much needed improvements in the

School Breakfast Program, as well as some limited expansion of WIC, which now serves only about one-third of those potentially eligible.

The importance of the array of nutritional services offered under H.R. 7 cannot be overstated. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7 which reauthorizes many important child nutrition programs including the universally applauded Women, Infants and Children [WIC] Program. It also includes a modest increase in funds for WIC and the School Breakfast Program. All funding levels included in this legislation fall within the guidelines of the first budget resolution.

The Women's Agenda of Pennsylvania has reported that "improved health care for expectant mothers would cut in half the mental retardation rate." More specifically, there is good evidence that babies born to mothers in the WIC program were 16 to 20 percent less likely to have below-normal birthweights. The House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families issued a report recently that found that for every \$1 invested in prenatal nutrition, the Government saves \$3 that would have been spent in correcting the health problems associated with low birthweight.

We should not forget that the growth level included in H.R. 7 is still not sufficient to meet demand. Even with its current record of success, the WIC Program is serving only one-third to a half of the people who qualify. In the present political climate, however, this bill is the best option.

If we do not invest in the future by nurturing our children, our society will inevitably suffer. Unfortunately, Government policies on all levels have allowed our children to fall behind all other age groups. The Congressional Budget Office recently reported that children make up the largest block of poor people in the country. Their poverty rate in 1983 was 22.2 percent, as compared to the 12.7 percent rate for the rest of the population. We must do all we can to reverse this trend by bolstering effective programs for children. The programs included in H.R. 7 begin to do just that.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, the five programs reauthorized by H.R. 7 are vital to a healthy America. Schoolchildren, pregnant women, infants, and preschool children rely on these programs to provide a minimum nutritional level to maintain health, growth, and well-being.

It is obvious that these important nutrition programs have improved the nutrition and the health of millions of Americans. As a farm State legislator, I would like to share another perspective as we move forward with the reauthorization of H.R. 7.

Farmers in America are involved in the noble endeavor of trying to feed a hungry world. It seems to me that there is something a bit inconsistent in a public policy that would allow us to build up tremendous surpluses of milk and grain when we have

nutrition needs in America. Farmers want to meet the needs of the hungry here at home and around the globe and it is for that reason that there is strong support for this proposal in our farm areas.

H.R. 7 will help us see to it that in America we do take care of the nutritional needs of our citizens.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7, which would reauthorize five expiring child nutrition programs, including the WIC Program, is a bill worthy of our support. WIC provides vital nutrition and health services to low-income pregnant women, and to postpartum women, infants, and children through age 4 who are at nutritional risk. Let me say that the budget resolution that we adopted in August permits the enactment of H.R. 7 with the \$121 million increase over the current services level for fiscal 1986, \$60 million of which will be directed toward the WIC Program. This new money will extend eligibility to those pregnant women who are not financially able to obtain proper nutrition, and to infants and children under age four. It is clear to me that the reason the budget resolution permitted this modest increase is due to the fact that: First, these programs are targeted to the poor; and second, these programs have been shown to be cost-effective.

There is overwhelming empirical evidence available to document that WIC participation is associated with a decreased incidence of low birthweight babies and neonatal mortality. There is no question that WIC participation by pregnant mothers can mean a real difference in the lives of their infants. The hidden costs for failing to provide WIC services include: the expense of neonatal intensive care, which could cost as much as \$100,000 per infant; the difficulty that mothers have in forming attachments to sick infants, which can lead to a decrease in the critical bonding between mother and child; increased incidences of child abuse among low-birthweight babies; delayed speech development has been observed in these babies; learning disabilities are common. In short, the failure to provide needed nutritional and health services to pregnant women has serious implications for the infant's potential in terms of education and future employment.

As the ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, may I recommend to my colleagues a recent bipartisan staff report entitled: "Opportunities for Success: Cost Effective Programs for Children." This report cites the cost benefit analyses done on the WIC Program and also presents data that shows the relationship between participation and positive pregnancy outcomes.

In short, WIC is one Federal program that is effective, on target, cost-effective, and deserving of reauthorization. I believe that WIC represents a critical strand of the family's social safety net. Clearly, an investment in children's nutrition is a solid investment with a high yield in terms of enhancing children's overall quality of life, improving educational readiness and positively affecting future employability.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985 as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

This bill extends five child nutrition programs through fiscal 1988 which are of great importance to our Nation's children. These reauthorized programs have proven to be extremely important in eliminating hunger and improving nutrition among children. Furthermore, these programs are cost-effective. Unfortunately, however, they have borne more than their share of the budget cuts in recent years.

In addition to the simple reauthorization, H.R. 7 provides \$121 million in additional funds for WIC and child nutrition programs. I share the concern of my constituents and my colleagues about the Federal budget deficit. However, we would be foolish to seek short-term savings which will result in long-term cost increases. For example, for every \$1 invested in the WIC Program, \$3 are saved in terms of later expenditures for health costs.

Let me also reemphasize that the funding levels authorized by H.R. 7 are within the spending limits in the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986. I feel that the \$121 million increase is a fiscally responsible and important to the effective operation of these programs. It is a small step toward restoring the funding which was cut in 1981.

I am concerned by several amendments which have been proposed which would weaken this bill. Our overriding concern in considering this legislation should be the welfare of our Nation's children. We must do all we can to assure they receive nutritionally balanced meals, and studies have shown that the school lunch and child nutrition programs are nutritionally important to children of all income levels. Reducing cash subsidies for some students threatens to shut down nearly half of the school lunch programs throughout the country. This is a sacrifice that I do not feel we can afford to make.

I commend the Education and Labor Committee for their fine work on this measure, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7 as reported by the committee.

Thank you.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act. While this program reauthorizes five expiring child nutrition programs, I would like to focus here on one of these—the WIC Program. In my home State of New Mexico we have over 63,000 individuals eligible for the WIC Program—of these 63,000 eligible participants less than one-third are currently receiving the help they need. The need for the WIC Program clearly exists. We need to not only keep this program alive—but also to expand it as much as possible within our fiscal constraints.

The bipartisan support for this bill is evident. H.R. 7's funding levels have been approved in the House/Senate budget resolution. I believe that it is significant that the conferees, even with their deep concern

over the deficit, felt that this program should not only be continued at current levels, but should also receive a modest increase in funding. WIC is acclaimed as one of the Federal Governments most successful programs. For every \$1 we invest in this program we get \$3 back. Not only is this program a wise investment in our children's future, but it also saves a great deal of money. The average cost for a hospital stay of an infant suffering from low-birthweight is \$60,000. The average cost of WIC is \$400 per year. WIC helps to prevent low-birthweight and neonatal problems requiring hospitalization.

I would like to strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985. These programs have clearly shown that they deserve our support as sound investments in our children's future. This is what President John F. Kennedy had to say on the issue over 20 years ago:

The prevention of future adult poverty and dependency must begin with the care of dependent children—those who must receive public welfare by virtue of a parent's death, disability, desertion or unemployment. Our society not only refuses to leave such children hungry, cold, and devoid of opportunity—we are insistent that such children not be community liabilities throughout their lives. Yet children who grow up in deprivation, with adequate protection, may be poorly equipped to meet adult responsibilities.

The School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985 address this societal obligation—a small amount of money spent now helps to solve future problems and to prevent a need for larger future expenditures.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of H.R. 7, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985, providing for the reauthorization of five expiring programs. These programs are: the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children, popularly called WIC; the Summer Food Service Program, serving low-income children; the Commodity Distribution Program providing support for both children and older Americans; the State Administrative Expenses Program [SAE]; and the Nutrition Education and Training [NET] program.

Although the House passed legislation reauthorizing these five programs last year by a vote of 343 to 72, the Senate failed to act on similar bills. Thus, the programs were temporarily authorized under the continuing resolution which expires at the end of this month—only a few days from now.

The bill passed by the House last year contained increases in funding amounting to \$378 million over current services. Although H.R. 7, which was reintroduced this year, included identical provisions, the chairman and members of the Education and Labor, during subcommittee markup, adopted a substitute which cut the \$378 million in increases to the absolute minimum of \$121 million. This \$121 million is provided for and assumed in the first

budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 recently approved by the Congress.

Last Thursday, September 12, there was much rhetoric on the floor of the House when it began consideration of H.R. 7. A few of our colleagues were using dollar figures that, if held up to the light of day, could not withstand our scrutiny if we are to be honest with ourselves and the public. The real reason those dollar figures won't hold up is because those figures were accompanied by claims that H.R. 7 contains NEW Program authority.

There were claims also that H.R. 7 contains NEW entitlements, and large increases in existing programs. None of those statements are true. There are only five programs being reauthorized—not authorized as new programs. There are no new programs in the bill. There are not any entitlements in the bill. There are no single large increases in the bill. In fact, current policy spending for these five programs now stands at \$5.640 billion, and H.R. 7 spending stands at \$5.761 billion—a level representing the modest \$121 million in increases recommended in H.R. 7 and, I repeat, a sum that is provided for and assumed by the first budget resolution recently adopted for fiscal year 1986.

Last week, some of my colleagues were heard to say that since the National School Lunch Act is a permanent program which requires no reauthorization, they have to take every opportunity that presents itself to bring up the subject, and that this bill presents such opportunity. They claim it is necessary to mention that permanent status of the School Lunch Act as though there is some criminal element in a program that is permanent. Permanent programs, they complain, are ongoing, continuous funding mechanisms that eat up the Federal budget, and the American taxpayer needs to hear about it.

Regrettably, some of my colleagues last week presented dollar figures that assumed a reauthorization of these 5 programs for 5 years. H.R. 7, however, is a 3-year bill—through 1988, not through 1990—and so the dollar figures were too high in terms of cumulative Federal costs over the life of the bill. They say the cost of feeding hungry children in the United States is too high. The 1981 reconciliation of the budget cut these programs by \$1.5 billion which was effective immediately, and since that time, the cumulative total of funding losses for child nutrition amounts to a whopping \$5.2 billion. Three million children have been cut from school lunch programs, and 1 million of those children were from low-income homes.

H.R. 7, obviously, is not attempting to restore the programs to their full, pre-1981 funding levels. But we are trying to add a modest sum of \$121 million to provide for the essential nutritional needs of poor children.

The largest increase in H.R. 7 is \$60 million for the WIC Program. The WIC Program is proven to be successful, assisting poor, pregnant women give birth to healthier, full-term babies. For those women who breast feed, postnatal nutritional needs are

met so that the babies remain healthy. We know that among poor pregnant women, premature births occur more frequently, and the result is low birth weight, birth defects, and developmental problems. Such problems require hospitalization of these babies for up to 30 days or more after birth, and the cost for such babies is \$2,000 a day. Poor parents obviously cannot pay \$2,000 a day for 30 days or more—and so the costs are borne by the American taxpayer through Federal support for health care and other welfare programs for the poor. The overall costs of the WIC Program is a wise investment that pays off on a three-for-one basis—for every \$1 invested, \$3 are saved in later medical costs. The modest \$60 million increase will bring approximately 120,000 additional women and children into the program next year.

The second largest increase in H.R. 7 is for school breakfasts, which will be increased by 6 cents per meal served, at a cost of \$42 million. The 6-cent increase in subsidy payments will go to improve the nutritional quality of breakfasts served. Recent USDA and GAO studies reveal that breakfasts now served are lacking in vitamins A, B₆, and iron. Breakfast programs are cost effective and highly targeted to the poor, and are found in predominantly low-income areas. Recent studies show that 90 percent of participants in the breakfast programs—3.3 million children—are from low-income homes.

The third largest increase in H.R. 7 is the Special Milk Program, at a cost of \$15 million. In 1981—again during the omnibus budget reconciliation—certain kindergarten children were eliminated from participation in the Special Milk Program because they attended schools that participated in the regular school lunch program which includes milk. Yet kindergarten children attend school in split sessions and thus are not in school during the time school lunches are served. They have no access to milk at all during their brief school day. The \$15 million in H.R. 7 would restore special milk to kindergarten children. The 1981 restriction cut 1 million children out of the program—and since 1981 the fastest growing segment of our population has been in the under-5-years-of-age group. These children are now ready for kindergarten, and should be able to have at least one milk break during school hours. Milk is an essential daily requirement for growing children's teeth and bones.

Finally, H.R. 7 contains a small increase of \$3 million that would assist in raising the tuition ceiling of private schools from \$1,500 to \$2,500 annually, allowing them to participate in the School Lunch Program. In 1981, when the \$1,500 tuition ceiling was imposed, 212 Catholic secondary schools were barred from the program, affecting 144,533 children. Another 288 private, non-church-related schools were also affected. If the tuition ceiling is not raised, the U.S. Catholic Conference predicts that an additional 241 Catholic schools, affecting 207,414 children, will be barred from the

School Lunch Program by September 1986 when tuitions are expected to increase.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude my remarks by reminding my colleagues that the National School Lunch Program was enacted in 1946 in order to safeguard the health and well-being of all our children, regardless of income. These child nutrition programs contained in H.R. 7 are as vital to our national security as the defense spending bill, because hungry children cannot learn, and a nation of high technology, particularly the military and defense demands for intellectual skills, cannot afford an uneducated society.

I know there are other amendments pending, and I will conclude my opening remarks at this time.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 7 without substantive amendments that would reduce funding below that assumed in the first budget resolution through elimination of the paid lunch subsidy, or the delay of the COLA for family day care providers, or the imposition of a means test for child care programs, or a reduction in the reimbursement rate for free and reduced price meals.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985. This bill extends five expiring child nutrition programs which are vitally important to the health of our Nation's young children.

We are seeing an ever-increasing hunger crisis in our Nation. It is directly related to the realities of poverty, and the stark facts regarding who is poor in America. Currently at least two out of every three adults who are poor in this country are women. Therefore, poverty and its accompanying problems of obtaining food, overwhelmingly affect women who are raising small children.

The largest budgetary portion of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments targets an increase in spending for the Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC], which would allow for extended services to 120,000 more pregnant women and small children. The administration wants to reduce funding for the WIC Program at a level that in no way maintains its present caseload. With the high rates of infant mortality among the children born to teenage women, we can hardly afford to reduce programs that have helped to prevent nutritional deficiencies during and after pregnancy.

In addition, H.R. 7 allows for continued budgetary strength in the school lunch programs, which presently serve some 24 million children in our Nation's schools. Again the administration seeks drastic cuts in this area. Somehow it believes that restricting support for school lunches to only low-income children will eliminate much needed Federal dollars. This kind of thinking shows no consideration for the overall effect these cuts will have on our schools' ability to even deliver current programs.

The majority of the lunches served in 21 percent of the schools fall in the category

of paid lunches. If funding for this category is eliminated, these schools lose up to 80 percent of the Federal support for their entire lunch program. This involves 11.6 million, or nearly half of the 24 million children currently receiving federally subsidized school lunches. Again, we are sacrificing our responsibility to provide for the welfare of all of our children.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 7, I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation. We are simply reauthorizing a continuation of five programs already established to provide for child nutrition. If we continue to allow the administration to make budget cuts in areas that improve the quality of life, then high risk pregnant women and small children with considerable health needs will continue to suffer.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act.

This bill extends five important child nutrition programs, including school breakfast, the special milk program for kindergarten children, and WIC, the Women, Infants, and Children supplemental feeding program.

Together, these programs plus the national school lunch program, provide well-balanced, nutritious meals to over 1.1 million Illinois school children each day. In addition to being good for children, these programs are good for the Illinois economy. Last year the school lunch program alone purchased \$41 million in school commodities from Illinois farmers.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I strongly supported the continuation of these programs. I believe their benefits are well documented. Time and again, proven studies have indicated that these programs provide the vital nutrients to ensure healthy growth; and we know that healthy, well-fed children are better prepared to learn in school. In addition, numerous studies have shown that these programs more than pay for themselves. Studies on the WIC program have shown that for every \$1 spent in the program, \$3 is saved in later medical costs.

Mr. Chairman, even though the benefits of this program are evident, there are some who would propose changes—changes which will threaten to cut millions of children from these important services.

Specifically, I strongly oppose an amendment which would cut the 12.5-cent cash subsidy under the National School Lunch Program. There is no doubt that these changes are complex, but the effect of this amendment is far more reaching than some would have us believe.

Currently, the program reimburses schools, through a combination of cash and commodities, for all full-paying students participating in the program. Additional funds are given so that low-income students can participate in either a free or reduced priced meals. The subsidy proposed to be reduced is not a cash subsidy to paying students, but is used by schools to run the basic operations of the school lunch program for all children.

What is a little more difficult to understand, is that for many schools across the country which do not serve large numbers of free or reduced priced lunches, the program is no longer cost-effective to operate without this subsidy. The effect of this amendment, therefore would be not only to close out paying students to a USDA nutritionally balanced meal as some would have us believe, but to deny those nutritional standards to many poor and middle-income students as well.

If this amendment were to pass, it would put school lunch programs in 390 Illinois schools in jeopardy. These are schools where 20 percent or less of the feeding program serves subsidized lunches to low-income children. This could mean that almost one-third of the sponsors currently operating in the State of Illinois would be forced to drop out of the program. Schools in Crawford, Champaign, Effingham, Douglas counties would be forced to close their programs, and throughout the State, over 140,000 students would no longer receive a nutritionally balanced meal.

Mr. Chairman, like my other distinguished colleagues, I am concerned about the budget deficit, and in fact have voted to cut over \$9 billion in unnecessary spending this year. But we should not be misled about H.R. 7. This bill is within the budget targets passed by both this House and our colleagues in the Senate. We should all be concerned about balancing the budget, but I would suggest we look to other areas where billions of dollars in waste and fraud are well documented, and not to areas that provided food for all our children.

Mr. Chairman, when the National School Lunch Program was first passed by Congress in 1946, its purpose was to safeguard the health and well-being of this country's most precious commodity—our children. I'm afraid that proposed amendments will undo what every Congress since that time has reaffirmed. I ask my colleagues to join me in keeping these programs in place and to pass H.R. 7.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 7, a bill to reauthorize and provide modest increases for five important child nutrition programs which have absorbed major reductions over the past 4 years.

Child nutrition programs are among the most important services provided by the Federal Government, but they are often misunderstood. These programs reimburse schools and child care providers for the meals they serve to eligible children, and by requiring that balanced, nutritious meals be served, they offer the dual benefits of providing sound nutrition while teaching good eating habits.

We talk about these programs in terms of subsidies, means tests and reimbursements, but they are more like insurance than welfare—insurance against hungry and malnourished kids who cannot concentrate in school because they are in poor health.

The School Lunch Program was created when we discovered that many of our young men were unfit for military service in World War II because of medical prob-

lems directly traceable to poor nutrition. At that time, we made a national policy decision to feed our poor children because our national security demands that our adults be well-nourished and physically fit.

Since 1981, the administration has repeatedly attempted to renege on that commitment, slashing funding for all nutrition programs with a particularly sharp blade reserved for those that feed our disadvantaged children. The Child Care Food Program, for example, which feeds children in day care centers and family care homes, has been cut by more than 30 percent. Other programs have fared only slightly better.

While I am sensitive to the need to contain Federal spending, I must emphasize that the House budget resolution assumed full funding of the child nutrition programs contained in H.R. 7. Our colleagues on the Budget Committee took this action because they share my conviction that we have gone far enough in cutting funds for these programs. They agree that we must restore and maintain our child nutrition insurance programs for the well-being of our children and our country.

I am strongly opposed to any amendments to H.R. 7 which would freeze or further reduce funding for the important and highly cost-effective child nutrition programs. In particular, I would like to speak against the amendment to extend the means test to the family day care portion of the Child Care Food Program, because I know that this form of child care is extremely valuable to working parents of very young children.

To fully understand the devastating effect of a means test, it is important to understand the difference between a family day care home and day care center.

Although a means test has been proposed every year since 1981, it has not been required for the family day care program because of the very nature of this type of day care. Family day care providers are essentially neighborhood operations, and the imposition of this burden would surely reduce participation on the part of both providers and parents. People are usually quite reluctant to share sensitive information on their income with their neighbors, and the administrative requirements of a means test would be virtually impossible to meet.

Child Care Food Program reimbursement is not paid to children nor is it paid to their families. It goes to the family day care provider—who typically earns, in my own State of Colorado, less than \$1 per hour per child for 10 hour days.

Although family day care providers earn very little for their hard work, working parents cannot afford to give them a raise to cover the additional cost of food. If two children are in full-time care at the rate of \$1 per hour per child, the day care bill for that family would exceed \$400 per month.

If we reduce participation in this program and cause an increase in the price of child care for those working families who are already barely making it, those families will not be able to afford to work and we

may inadvertently drive them onto the welfare rolls.

Family day care, because it operates out of the home, is very difficult to regulate or monitor. Providers who participate in the Child Care Food Program receive training and actual home visits from sponsoring organizations. In many States, this is the only time these facilities are observed in operation. Given our national concern for the rise in child abuse, it would not be wise to eliminate this already minimal supervision.

More than half of all the children in this country who are cared for outside of their family home during the day are cared for in family day care homes.

Mr. Chairman, the child nutrition programs that these amendments would dramatically weaken represent a tiny fraction of the Federal budget and yet are extremely effective in eliminating hunger among our children. These programs have already made a major contribution to deficit reduction by absorbing large budget cuts. By cutting still deeper, we gain very little, but our children lose a lot.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act. While this program reauthorizes five expiring child nutrition programs, I would like to focus here on one of these—the WIC Program. In my home State of New Mexico, we have over 63,000 individuals eligible for the WIC Program—of these, 63,000 eligible participants, less than one-third are currently receiving the help they need. The need for the WIC Program clearly exists. We need to not only keep this program alive, but also to expand it as much as possible within our fiscal constraints.

The bipartisan support for this bill is evident. H.R. 7's funding levels have been approved in the House/Senate budget resolution. I believe that it is significant that the conferees, even with their deep concern over the deficit, felt that this program should not only be continued at current levels, but should also receive a modest increase in funding. WIC is acclaimed as one of the Federal Government's most successful programs. For every dollar we invest in this program, we get three back. Not only is this program a wise investment in our children's future, but it also saves a great deal of money. The average cost for a hospital stay of an infant suffering from low birth weight is \$60,000; the average cost of WIC is \$400 per year. WIC helps to prevent low birth weight and neonatal problems requiring hospitalization.

I would like to strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985—these programs have clearly shown that they deserve our support as sound investments in our children's future. This is what President John F. Kennedy had to say on the issue over 20 years ago:

The prevention of future adult poverty and dependency must begin with the care of dependent children—those who must receive public welfare by virtue of a parent's death, disability, desertion or unemploy-

ment. Our society not only refuses to leave such children hungry, cold, and devoid of opportunity—we are insistent that such children not be community liabilities throughout their lives. Yet children who grow up in deprivation, with adequate protection, may be poorly equipped to meet adult responsibilities.

The School Lunch and Child Nutrition Amendments of 1985 address this societal obligation; a small amount of money spent now helps to solve future problems and to prevent a need for larger future expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SMITH of Iowa] having assumed the chair, Mr. SWIFT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7), to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, pursuant to House Resolution 262, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 367, nays 59, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—367

Ackerman	Bereuter	Bruce	Coleman (TX)	Hoyer	Obey
Akaka	Berman	Bryant	Collins	Hubbard	Olin
Alexander	Blaggi	Burton (CA)	Conte	Huckaby	Ortiz
Anderson	Billrakis	Bustamante	Conyers	Hughes	Owens
Andrews	Boehlert	Byron	Cooper	Hutto	Panetta
Annunzio	Boggs	Campbell	Coughlin	Hyde	Parris
Anthony	Boland	Carper	Courter	Ireland	Pashayan
Applegate	Boner (TN)	Carr	Coyne	Jacobs	Pease
Aspin	Bonior (MI)	Chandler	Crockett	Jeffords	Penny
Atkins	Bonker	Chapman	Daniel	Jenkins	Pepper
AuCoin	Borski	Chappell	Darden	Johnson	Perkins
Barnard	Bosco	Chapple	Daschle	Jones (NC)	Petri
Barnes	Boucher	Clay	Davis	Jones (OK)	Pickle
Bateman	Boxer	Clinger	de la Garza	Jones (TN)	Price
Bates	Breaux	Coats	Dellums	Kanjorski	Pursell
Bedell	Brooks	Cobey	Derrick	Kaptur	Quillen
Beilenson	Broomfield	Coble	DeWine	Kasich	Ray
Bennett	Brown (CA)	Coelho	Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Regula
Bentley	Broyhill	Coleman (MO)	Dicks	Kemp	Reid
			Dingell	Kennelly	Richardson
			DioGuardi	Kildee	Ridge
			Dixon	Kindness	Rinaldo
			Donnelly	Klecza	Ritter
			Dorgan (ND)	Kolbe	Robinson
			Dornan (CA)	Kolter	Rodino
			Dowdy	Kostmayer	Roe
			Downey	LaFalce	Roemer
			Duncan	Lagomarsino	Rogers
			Durbin	Lantos	Rose
			Dwyer	Leach (IA)	Rostenkowski
			Dymally	Leath (TX)	Roukema
			Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Rowland (CT)
			Early	Leland	Rowland (GA)
			Eckart (OH)	Lent	Roybal
			Edgar	Levin (MI)	Russo
			Edwards (CA)	Levine (CA)	Sabo
			Edwards (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Savage
			Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Saxton
			English	Lightfoot	Scheuer
			Erdreich	Lipinski	Schneider
			Evans (IA)	Livingston	Schroeder
			Evans (IL)	Lloyd	Schuette
			Fascell	Lowry (WA)	Schulze
			Fawell	Lujan	Schumer
			Fazio	Luken	Seiberling
			Feighan	Lundine	Sharp
			Fish	MacKay	Shaw
			Flippo	Madigan	Shelby
			Florio	Manton	Sikorski
			Foglietta	Markey	Siljander
			Foley	Marlenee	Slusky
			Ford (MI)	Martin (NY)	Skeen
			Ford (TN)	Martinez	Skelton
			Fowler	Matsui	Slattery
			Frank	Mavroules	Slaughter
			Franklin	Mazzoli	Smith (FL)
			Frenzel	McCain	Smith (IA)
			Fuqua	McCloskey	Smith (NE)
			Gallo	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
			Garcia	McCurdy	Smith, Robert
			Gaydos	McDade	Snowe
			Gejdenson	McEwen	Snyder
			Gekas	McGrath	Solarz
			Gephardt	McHugh	Solomon
			Gibbons	McKernan	Spence
			Gillman	McKinney	Spratt
			Gingrich	McMillan	St Germain
			Glickman	Meyers	Staggers
			Gonzalez	Mica	Stallings
			Goodling	Michel	Stangeland
			Gordon	Mikulski	Stark
			Gradison	Miller (CA)	Stokes
			Gray (IL)	Miller (OH)	Stratton
			Gray (PA)	Miller (WA)	Studds
			Green	Mineta	Sundquist
			Gregg	Mitchell	Swift
			Grotberg	Moakley	Synar
			Guarini	Mollinari	Tallon
			Gunderson	Mollohan	Tauke
			Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Tauzin
			Hall, Ralph	Moody	Taylor
			Hamilton	Moore	Thomas (CA)
			Hammerschmidt	Morrison (CT)	Thomas (GA)
			Hatcher	Morrison (WA)	Torres
			Hawkins	Mrazek	Torricelli
			Hayes	Murphy	Towns
			Hefner	Murtha	Traficant
			Heftel	Myers	Traxler
			Hendon	Natcher	Udall
			Henry	Neal	Valentine
			Hertel	Nelson	Vento
			Hiller	Nichols	Visclosky
			Hillis	Nowak	Volkmer
			Hopkins	O'Brien	Vucanovich
			Horton	Oakar	Walgren
			Howard	Oberstar	Watkins

Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams

Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden

Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

□ 1725

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous material, on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE ROMANIAN GOVERNMENT SHOULD ALLOW CERTAIN CITIZENS TO EMIGRATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, throughout my years in Congress, I have heard from a number of constituents concerned about citizens of Communist countries who have been approved for immigrant visas to the United States by our Department of State, but were denied permission by their own governments to leave.

Yesterday, a lady who lives in District 4 in the State of Arizona, who fled Romania 16 years ago and is now a citizen of the United States telephoned my office in desperation, requesting assistance. She asked that our Government use its influence to encourage the Romanian authorities to allow her 52-year old brother and his wife, Vasile and Evdochia Preda, permission to emigrate to the United States.

Mr. Preda has already lost his job because of his attempts to leave Romania. He is now on the third day of a hunger strike protesting the Romanian Government's refusal to give him and so many others permission to emigrate from that country.

The State Department periodically presents to Communist authorities the names of those who have repeatedly been denied permission to emigrate in an effort to emphasize the deeply felt belief that persons should not be held in a country against their will.

I am contacting the Department of State to ask that they include Mr. Preda and his wife's names on the list and to do all possible to help them. With this statement, I am calling on the Romanian Government to exercise compassion and allow the Predas and others like them to emigrate from the country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 12, 1985, I was unavoidably absent for roll No. 302, the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2266. This bill authorizes appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and establishes a commission to study the financial status of Amtrak. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, due to official duties in my district on Thursday, September 12, I missed rollcall votes numbered 302 through 307.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yes" on No. 302; "present" on No. 303; "yes" on No. 304; "yes" on No. 305; "present" on No. 306; and "no" No. 307.

TO CREATE A NATIONAL COMMISSION TO PREVENT INFANT MORTALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to create a National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality.

A baby born in Western Europe, Japan, Australia, Singapore, or Hong Kong has a better chance of celebrating its first birthday than does an American baby. This is a great tragedy, particularly in the light of the fact that we live in one of the wealthiest and most technically advanced nations in the world.

In my State of North Carolina, there is an infant mortality rate of 13.7 per thousand births; 1,175 babies died in 1982 before turning 1 year old.

Low birthweight is the main cause of infant mortality. Low birthweight is 2 pounds or less. Even though the United States has made great strides in reducing infant mortality since 1965, the decrease in deaths is mainly due to medical and technological advances in keeping low birthweight babies alive. So, if we are to solve the problem of infant mortality, we must fight against low birthweight.

The effects of infant mortality are far-reaching in our society. It is impossible to measure the trauma a family suffers when a baby dies. This is the human cost. There are also the economic costs. Over \$1.5 billion is spent every year to keep low birthweight babies alive. If the low birthweight child is permanently handicapped, the later cost of addressing that child's needs will even greater. Clearly, it is much more cost effective to deal with the problem of low birthweight, than to have to deal with its consequences.

The National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality will provide a well-

NAYS—59

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Billey
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Carney
Cheney
Combest
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
Dreier
Eckert (NY)

Fiedler
Fields
Hansen
Hartnett
Holt
Hunter
Kramer
Latta
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Martin (IL)
McCandless
Monson
Moorhead
Nielsen
Oxley
Packard

Porter
Roberts
Roth
Rudd
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Smith (NH)
Smith, Denny
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sweeney
Swindall
Vander Jagt
Walker
Whittaker
Zschau

NOT VOTING—8

Addabbo
Bevill
Frost

Lehman (CA)
Long
Rahall

Rangel
Waxman

□ 1710

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANDERSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 7, SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

thought out and well-organized national policy to prevent infant deaths. It will review present governmental and private efforts to prevent infant mortality and then come up with a national policy that the Federal Government, States, localities, and private groups could adopt to prevent infant deaths. This Commission will make legislative recommendations directly to Congress as to the most effective ways to fight infant mortality. In short, this Commission will set up a comprehensive plan of action to fight infant mortality.

I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this important legislation.

EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Education Technology Act of 1985, a bill designed to help our elementary and secondary schools use computers more effectively as learning tools in the classroom. This legislation will help ensure that our next generation of graduates is adequately prepared to meet the challenges of tomorrow's technologically advanced workplace.

In January of this year, the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness completed a year-long study of our nation's ability to compete. The Commission's report, entitled "Global Competition, The New Reality," is a thoughtful but resounding indictment of the extent to which we, as a nation, have neglected those aspects of our economy which determine how well we compete in world markets.

In the area of human resource development, one of the primary findings of the study was that "this nation has not effectively used technology to enhance its educational offerings. Interactive computers can be powerful learning tools, yet little educational software has been developed that makes full use of their capabilities. 'Computer literacy' has become the focus of computer use in schools, yet it is the use of computers as a new and more productive way of learning that offers the greatest potential of educational technology."

To remedy this situation, the Commission calls for "sustained Federal support" for a program of research in educational software, to be funded through the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education. In addition, the report recommends that teachers be trained in the use of computers as well as in the capabilities of quality software. States should be encouraged to provide such training and the Federal Government should aid in these efforts by disseminating information on available software.

Two years ago, I first introduced the Computer Literacy Act to address these very issues. In 1984, that legislation was reported by both the Education and Labor Committee and the Science and Technology Committee. Unfortunately, it was never

considered by the full House of Representatives. Yet the need for the legislation has not diminished, and in many ways the arguments for its passage have grown more compelling.

In the past 5 years, the number of computers in schools across the country has risen dramatically. More than 1 million are now estimated to be in use and that figure is expected to double in the next 4 years. While the sheer number of computers has expanded, however, the success with which they have been integrated into our education system remains doubtful. Great technical progress has been made by those teachers and students who have computer access, but as the President's Commission report emphasizes, teachers are still not adequately equipped to tap the vast educational potential of computer technology. If "computer literacy" is no longer adequate to ensure that America has a technologically prepared workforce to carry us into the 21st century, then we must strive for the complete and interactive integration of advanced technology into educational curricula.

Finally, recent studies indicate that schools with the highest proportion of low-income children are still losing ground in the effort to reduce student-to-computer ratios. Students in school districts with the lowest poverty levels are estimated to average one computer for every 57 students while those schools with the highest poverty levels tend to have one computer for every 83 students. Educators across the country express concern about the fate of these "computer have-nots" whose school districts lack funds for sufficient computer equipment and whose parents cannot afford to buy home computers.

In short, without some type of corrective intervention, tomorrow's workers may not be prepared to enter a workplace where technological change has become the rule rather than the exception.

For these reasons, I have introduced the Education Technology Act of 1985, an updated version of the Computer Literacy Act of the 98th Congress. The bill has three purposes. Section I would encourage the development of model educational software and call upon the National Institute of Education and the National Science Foundation, through grants or contracts, to evaluate existing software and make that information readily available to our nation's school districts. The second section would establish teacher training institutes to improve the integration of education technology into the classroom and would extend technological training to adults through model programs to be offered during nonschool hours. The last section of the bill would provide schools still without access to computers with the funds to purchase computer hardware.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues in the House to give this bill their strong support so that we can begin, as a nation, to regain our competitive edge at home and abroad.

METHANOL, FUEL OF THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, every Memorial Day, in Indianapolis, the premier event in auto racing—the Indy 500—is run. These Indy vehicles run on methanol, a clean, safe, efficient alcohol fuel.

Today, my colleagues and I are introducing a bill which will help methanol become a common consumer fuel as well. Methanol is an alcohol fuel which can be made from a variety of domestic resources—most importantly, coal and natural gas.

It is a liquid fuel; it is safe; it is clean; and it is efficient.

The widespread substitution of methanol for gasoline and diesel fuel in our cars, trucks, and buses will achieve four important national goals: reduction of the trade deficit, improved energy security, better air quality, and more jobs.

BALANCE OF TRADE

Our national bill for imported oil last year was almost \$60 billion, over half of our trade deficit. Methanol has the potential to be made entirely from domestic resources. Conversion of 20 percent of U.S. cars to a domestically produced fuel would reduce oil imports by approximately 470 million barrels per year and might reduce the balance of payment deficit by well over \$10 billion annually.

ENERGY SECURITY

By the end of the century OPEC may again be able to control the price of crude oil because demand will approach the world's production capacity and they will become the world's marginal producers. They will never be the marginal producer of methanol, however, and we should take steps now to substitute methanol for the 40 percent of our oil that is used for transportation. To the extent we can reduce our demand for petroleum-based transportation fuel we will reduce OPEC's ability to control the market and our vulnerability to their actions.

CLEAN AIR

There are also major environmental benefits of methanol. Methanol buses may forever eliminate the stench and pollution currently associated with intracity buses. If widely adopted, methanol in cars also has the potential to be the single largest contributor to reduction of smog in our cities.

JOBS

A 1984 report by the staff of the Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee estimates that conversion of 20 percent of U.S. cars to methanol could create a market for an additional 300 million tons of coal per year if the methanol is produced from domestic coal. This increase in demand for coal would translate directly into 10,000 jobs in the coal mining industry and an undetermined number of other jobs in methanol production.

PROBLEMS OF INTRODUCTION

In short, methanol is a nearly perfect substitute for gasoline. What then prevents methanol from rapidly capturing the transportation fuel market? Two related factors: the lack of vehicles designed to run on methanol, and the lack of readily available retail sales outlets.

The problem is that methanol won't be distributed as a consumer fuel until there are sufficient vehicles able to run on this fuel. Conversely, the vehicle manufacturers will not manufacture methanol-compatible vehicles until the fuel is widely available. This circular problem is commonly called the chicken and egg dilemma.

This bill is designed to stimulate a solution to this problem through a low-cost Federal demonstration program. It continues the work already underway by the Department of Energy, Department of Defense, California Energy Commission, Bank of America, and others. The Federal demonstration fleet will be relatively inexpensive since it will replace conventionally fueled with methanol-fueled vehicles that the Federal Government would have purchased in any case.

COST

Methanol vehicles are not greatly different from those fueled by conventional fuels. Only a few components need to be made compatible with methanol, and manufacturers have testified that methanol cars will be no more expensive than similar gasoline cars when manufactured in similar quantity.

Nor is methanol more costly. Currently, most of the world's methanol is made from natural gas and sells for about \$0.45 per gallon in bulk quantities. Because methanol has a lower energy content per gallon than gasoline, and nearly 2 gallons of methanol are required to take a car as far as 1 gallon of gasoline, this price would make methanol very competitive with gasoline if both were equally available to the consumer.

In the long term, methanol may have a cost advantage over gasoline. The United States has abundant coal reserves which can be utilized to manufacture methanol. Estimates vary widely on the cost of manufacturing it from coal, but they tend to be in the \$0.80 to \$1.20 per gallon range. At these prices, methanol from coal is not economic today.

Generally, however, the price of coal is expected to rise more slowly than the price of oil and natural gas. Sometime early in the next century, methanol from coal will be competitive with gasoline made from imported crude oil. In the meantime, methanol made from natural gas is likely to be available and competitive in price.

PROMOTING COMPETITION

For all of these reasons, methanol is likely to be the fuel of the future. But to capture its benefits more quickly, we need to overcome the chicken and egg problem—to help methanol reach the threshold level of use at which consumers have a choice and methanol can compete.

In order to hasten the day when methanol is competitively viable, this bill proposes an action plan that requires:

Five thousand methanol cars purchased annually by the Government starting in fiscal year 1987;

A long haul, 18-wheel methanol truck demonstration;

A methanol bus demonstration;

That, if the methanol bus demonstration provides satisfactory results, all buses purchased in Clean Air Act nonattainment areas with Federal assistance after 1991 will be required to be methanol buses;

Establishment of an interagency commission to coordinate all the methanol work underway within the Government;

A requirement that all vehicles purchased by the Federal Government be guaranteed by the manufacturer for use on all EPA approved nonstandard fuels; and

An incentive for auto manufacturers to produce methanol compatible vehicles by calculating miles per gallon for purposes of CAFE standards on the basis of the petroleum content of the fuel. Vehicles capable of running on both methanol and gasoline will be counted for CAFE calculations as if the vehicle only ran on methanol. This concept is more fully explained in my 1984 letter to the EPA, which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with a copy of the text of the bill itself.

This bill is a follow-on to legislation introduced last Congress—H.R. 4855 and H.R. 5075. It is based on 4 days of public hearings, a 1984 subcommittee staff report, and hundreds of hours of discussion with industry representatives.

Last year the methanol legislation, parts of which were enacted, had over 50 cosponsors. DOE is proceeding with a preliminary vehicle fleet. This bill is the next logical step in the Government's role to prove the potential and accelerate the adoption of methanol as an alternative to gasoline.

The current surplus in crude oil supplies gives this Nation the opportunity to develop its alternative fuels. Methanol is one of the best of these alternative fuels, and this bill is necessary to advance its development.

H.R. 3355

A bill to develop a national methanol energy policy and to coordinate efforts to implement such policy

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the "Methanol Energy Policy Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the achievement of long-term energy security for the United States is essential to the health of the national economy, the well-being of our citizens, and the maintenance of national security;

(2) the protection and improvement of the Nation's air quality is essential to our citizens' physical health;

(3) the displacement of energy derived from imported oil with domestically produced energy will contribute to an improved

international trade balance for the United States and increased employment opportunities for our citizens;

(4) the Nation's security, environmental, and economic interests require that the Federal Government should assist a clean-burning domestically produced transportation fuel to reach a threshold level of use at which it can successfully compete with petroleum-based fuels;

(5) methanol is the alternative liquid fuel with the best technological and economic prospect of displacing significant quantities of petroleum-based transportation fuel;

(6) there are proven coal reserves in the United States sufficient to provide methanol for transportation use for at least the next four hundred years;

(7) the use of methanol to displace gasoline and diesel fuel in the Nation's automobiles, trucks, and buses will significantly reduce emission of regulated pollutants, reduce reliance on imported oil, and enhance the Nation's security; and

(8) the United States Department of Energy and the California Energy Commission have already established a base of information about methanol as a transportation fuel which this Act will further develop.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to provide—

(1) that the Federal Government shall—
(A) continue the development of a methanol demonstration program by increasing the purchases and use of methanol-powered passenger automobiles, light duty trucks, and buses;

(B) in cooperation with a commercial operator, establish a demonstration program for the operation of methanol-fueled diesel trucks;

(C) establish a pilot program for the operation of methanol-powered buses in urban areas;

(D) Assist State and local entities in purchasing methanol-powered buses;

(E) study the feasibility of a small, packaged, relocatable methane to methanol plant;

(F) study the air quality and human health effects associated with the use of significant amounts of methanol;

(G) remove disincentives to the use of methanol fuel;

(H) promote the availability and use of methanol fuel; and

(I) promote the manufacture and purchase of methanol-powered vehicles, and

(2) for the establishment of an Interagency Commission on Methanol to develop and coordinate the implementation of a national methanol energy policy.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT OF ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.

Title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART J—ENCOURAGING THE USE OF METHANOL

"SEC. 400AA. METHANOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL VEHICLES.

"(a) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall ensure that of the total number of passenger automobiles and light duty trucks acquired for use by the Federal Government during the fiscal years ending September 30, 1987, September 30, 1988, September 30, 1989, and September 30, 1990, at least 5,000 each year shall be methanol-powered vehicles.

"(b) STUDIES.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environ-

mental Protection Agency (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Administrator") shall conduct studies related to the methanol-powered vehicles acquired under subsection (a), including—

"(1) projects to demonstrate the performance of such vehicles,

"(2) an evaluation of the performance of such vehicles in cold weather,

"(3) a study of the fuel economy, safety, and emissions of such vehicles, and

"(4) a comparison of the operation and maintenance costs of such vehicles to the operation and maintenance costs of other passenger automobiles and light duty trucks.

"(c) METHANOL MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC.—(1) At locations where vehicles acquired under subsection (a) are supplied with methanol, methanol shall be offered for sale to the public for use in other vehicles, except in cases where security considerations require otherwise.

"(2) The requirement under paragraph (1) shall not apply after September 30, 1990.

"(d) FEDERAL AGENCY USE OF DEMONSTRATION VEHICLES.—(1) Upon the request of the head of any agency of the Federal Government, the Secretary shall ensure that such Federal agency be provided with vehicles acquired under subsection (a) to the maximum extent practicable.

"(2) The Secretary shall ensure that the cost to any Federal agency receiving a vehicle under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the cost to such agency of a comparable gasoline-powered vehicle.

"(3) Only one-half of the vehicles obtained under this section by an agency of the Federal Government shall be counted against any limitation under law, Executive order, or executive or agency policy on the number of vehicles which may be obtained by such agency.

"(4) Any Federal agency receiving a vehicle under paragraph (1) shall cooperate with the study undertaken by the Secretary under subsection (b).

"(e) DETAIL OF PERSONNEL.—Upon the request of the Secretary, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Department of Energy, to assist the Secretary in carrying out his duties under this section.

"(f) REPORTS.—(1) The Secretary shall submit semiannual reports of the actions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress. The first such report shall be submitted no later than the last day of the second quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this part. The last such report shall be submitted no later than September 30, 1990.

"(2) The Secretary shall submit a final report summarizing all actions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress no later than October 15, 1990.

"(g) EXEMPTIONS.—Methanol vehicles obtained under this section or with funds appropriated by the joint resolution entitled "A Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes." (P.L. 98-473)—

"(1) shall not be counted in any calculation of Fleet Average Fuel Economy under section 510 of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (15 U.S.C. 2010) or Executive Order 12375; and

"(2) shall not be subject to any limitation under law on the maximum cost of individual vehicles which may be obtained by the United States.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'methanol-powered vehicle' means passenger automobiles and light duty trucks designed to operate using a fuel composed of at least 85 percent methanol; and

"(2) the term 'acquired' means leased for a period of sixty continuous days or more, or purchased.

"(i) FUNDING.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, \$10,000,000, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, \$8,000,000, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, \$5,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, \$5,000,000, to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) The authority of the Secretary to obligate amounts to be expended under this section shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

"SEC. 400BB. METHANOL LONG-HAUL TRUCK DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in cooperation with a commercial operator or operators of long-haul diesel trucks, shall establish a demonstration program for the operation of methanol fueled diesel trucks on a long-haul, high density interstate truck route.

"(b) AVAILABILITY OF METHANOL.—(1) The Secretary shall make necessary arrangements to ensure the availability of methanol along the interstate truck route selected for the demonstration program established under subsection (a).

"(2) At locations where trucks operating under the demonstration program established under subsection (a) are supplied with methanol, methanol shall be offered for sale to the public for use in other vehicles, except in cases where security considerations require otherwise.

"(c) REPORTS.—(1) The Secretary shall submit semiannual reports of the actions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress. The first such report shall be submitted no later than the last day of the second quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this part. The last such report shall be submitted no later than September 30, 1990.

"(2) The Secretary shall submit a final report summarizing all actions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress no later than October 15, 1990.

"(d) FUNDING.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for the period encompassing the fiscal years ending September 30, 1987, September 30, 1988, September 30, 1989, and September 30, 1990, a total of \$2,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) The authority of the Secretary to obligate amounts to be expended under this section shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

"SEC. 400CC. METHANOL-POWERED BUS PILOT PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, purchase at least five methanol-powered buses and shall use such buses in urban settings for purposes of emissions and fuel economy testing.

"(b) TESTING AND REPORTS.—(1) The Administrator shall test the emissions levels and fuel economy of buses purchased under subsection (a), shall study the potential for problems described in section 400DD(c), and shall submit semi-annual reports of the ac-

tions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress.

"(2) The Administrator shall submit a final report summarizing all actions taken and findings made under this section to the Congress no later than December 31, 1989.

"(c) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the period encompassing the fiscal years ending September 30, 1987, September 30, 1988, September 30, 1989, and September 30, 1990, a total of \$4,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 400DD. REQUIREMENT THAT BUSES PURCHASED WITH FEDERAL FUNDS BE METHANOL-POWERED.

"(a) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any State or political subdivision thereof which receives, after January 1, 1991, any Federal assistance to provide mass transportation to acquire motor vehicles designed to transport thirty individuals or more for operation in a nonattainment area, as such term is defined in section 171(2) of the Clean Air Act, shall acquire methanol-powered buses with such assistance.

"(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) The Secretary shall provide to each State or political subdivision thereof which acquires any methanol-powered bus a supplemental grant equal to 100 percent of the amount, if any, by which the acquisition, operation, and maintenance costs of such methanol-powered bus exceed the acquisition, operation, and maintenance costs of a comparable diesel-powered bus.

"(2) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations no later than January 1, 1990, to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall implement this section unless, as a result of the study under section 400CC(b), the Administrator finds by rule, either on a nationwide or a case by case basis, after an opportunity for oral presentation is afforded interested persons, evidence of substantial—

"(1) operating and maintenance problems with vehicles studied under such section;

"(2) increases in exhaust emissions from such vehicles that are regulated under the Clean Air Act as compared to gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles;

"(3) increases in the cost, excluding all one-time startup, training, and conversion costs, of operation and maintenance of such vehicles as compared to gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles; or

"(4) increases in human health risks associated with exhaust emissions not regulated under the Clean Air Act.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'methanol-powered bus' means a methanol-powered vehicle which is designed to transport thirty individuals or more, and

"(2) the term 'mass transportation' means transportation which provides to the public general or special service (but not including schoolbuses or charter or sightseeing service) on a regular and continuing basis.

"(e) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1991, September 30, 1992, and September 30, 1993.

"SEC. 400EE. INTERAGENCY COMMISSION ON METHANOL.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the Interagency Commission on Methanol, which shall develop a national methanol energy policy

and coordinate efforts to implement such policy.

"(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of members as follows:

"(1) The Secretary of Energy, or the designee of the Secretary, who shall be the chairperson of the Commission;

"(2) The Secretary of Defense or the designee of such Secretary;

"(3) the Secretary of the Interior or the designee of such Secretary;

"(4) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the designee of such Administrator;

"(5) the Secretary of Transportation or the designee of such Secretary;

"(6) the Postmaster General or the designee of the Postmaster General;

"(7) the Administrator of the General Services Administration or the designee of such Administrator;

"(8) the Administrator of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the designee of such Administrator; and

"(9) such other officers and employees of the Federal Government as may be appointed to the Commission by the Secretary.

"(c) OPERATIONS.—(1) The Commission shall meet as necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, at the call of the chairperson of the Commission.

"(2) One-third of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(3) No member of the Commission shall receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of the service of such member on the Commission.

"(4) The Secretary shall provide the Commission with such staff and office facilities as the Secretary, following consultation with the Commission, considers necessary to permit the Commission to carry out its duties under this section.

"(d) DUTIES.—(1) The Commission shall study the following issues or ensure that such issues are studied:

"(A) The economics of the production and use of methanol as a transportation, boiler, and turbine fuel and the production, sale, and marketing of methanol-powered vehicles.

"(B) The production of methanol from domestic sources such as coal.

"(C) Suggestions submitted to the Commission, by individuals in the private sector, for promoting the use of methanol as a fuel for buses and other motor vehicles.

"(D) The ability of methanol to meet the military and nonmilitary transportation fuel needs of the United States during a time of general military mobilization.

"(E) The use of methanol for overfiring stationary boilers and peaking turbines, and for fuel cells.

"(F) Environmental, health, and safety issues relating to methanol and its combustion products and methanol-powered vehicles.

"(2) The Commission shall develop a long-term plan for the commercialization of methanol as an alternative fuel.

"(3) The Commission shall coordinate all Federal efforts with respect to methanol research and commercialization.

"(4)(A) The Commission shall ensure communication between representatives of all Federal agencies that are involved in methanol demonstration projects or that have an interest in such projects.

"(B) The Commission shall establish a clearinghouse for the exchange of information between parties working with or interested in working with methanol and related products.

"(e) PRIVATE SECTOR ADVISORY PANEL.—(1) The chairperson of the Commission shall establish a private sector advisory panel to inform the Commission about methanol-related matters. Such chairperson shall appoint the members of the panel.

"(2) The members of the panel shall be persons employed in the private sector or by State or local government who are knowledgeable about methanol and its possible uses and the production of methanol and methanol-powered vehicles. Such members may not be full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) The panel shall meet at the call of the chairperson of the Commission.

"(4) The members of the panel may be compensated at a rate, to be fixed by the Secretary, that does not exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable under the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel-time) when engaged in the actual duties of the panel and when not otherwise compensated as officers or employees of the Federal Government, except that such compensation for any year may not exceed compensation for 20 days of engagement in the actual duties of the panel. All such members, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Federal Government service employed intermittently. Payments under this section shall not render members of the panel officers or employees of the Federal Government for any purpose.

"(5) The Secretary shall provide the panel with such staff and facilities as the Secretary, following consultation with the Commission and the panel, considers necessary to permit the panel to carry out its duties under this subsection. Any such staff and facilities shall be provided from the existing staff and facilities of the Department of Energy.

"(f) DETAIL OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section.

"(g) REPORTS.—(1) The Commission shall, not later than September 30 of each of the years 1978, 1988, and 1989, submit an interim report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken and findings made by the Commission under subsection (d).

"(2) The Commission shall, not later than September 30, 1990, submit a final report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken and findings made by the Commission under subsection (d).

"(3) The results of any study or studies undertaken under subsection (d) shall be made available to the public at such times and in such manner as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

"(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission and the panel shall terminate upon submission of the final report of the Commission under subsection (g)(2).

"(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'Commission' means the Interagency Commission on Methanol established in subsection (a).

"(2) The term 'methanol-powered vehicle' means a motor vehicle designed to operate using a fuel composed of not less than 85 percent methanol.

"(3) The term 'panel' means the private sector advisory panel established in subsection (e)(1).

"SEC. 400FF. STUDIES.

"(a) METHANOL STUDIES.—(1) The Secretary shall undertake a study of the comparative costs of methanol based on natural gas, methanol based on coal, and methanol based on other resources. Such study shall include a study of various sizes of facilities for each resource, and shall—

"(A) identify the optimum size for obtaining maximum economies of scale;

"(B) identify the largest size feasible consistent with current and projected near-term demand for methanol; and

"(C) consider and quantify 'learning curve' benefits associated with the sequential construction of additional facilities.

"(2) In conducting studies under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include a study of a packaged, nominally, 100 to 300 ton per day, relocatable natural gas to methanol plant that is capable of utilizing current domestic supplies of unutilized natural gas.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'unutilized natural gas' means gas that is available in small remote fields and cannot be economically utilized in existing conventional natural gas pipelines, or gas the quality of which is so poor that extensive and uneconomic pretreatment is required prior to its introduction into the natural gas distribution system.

"(4) The Secretary shall submit a report containing the results of the studies undertaken under paragraph (1) to the Congress within one year after the date of the enactment of this part.

"(b) AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH STUDY.—(1) The Administrator shall prepare a comprehensive analysis with respect to the air pollutant emission, air quality impact, and human health risks, including toxicity to consumers at self-service fuel pumps, associated with the storage, distribution, and use of significant amounts of methanol as transportation fuel as compared to existing diesel and gasoline fuels.

"(2) The Administrator shall complete the comprehensive analysis required by paragraph (1) within two years after the date of the enactment of this part unless the Administrator explains in writing to the Congress why more time is necessary for its completion.

"(c) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section \$975,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987."

SEC. 4. FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.

The Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (15 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 501 (15 U.S.C. 2001) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(15) The term 'methanol mixture' means the mixture of methanol with other fuel, if any, used to operate a methanol powered automobile.

"(16) The term 'methanol powered automobile' means an automobile capable of operating, and marketed and sold with the intention of its being primarily operated, on not less than 85 percent methanol; and

(2) in section 503(d) (15 U.S.C. 2003(d)) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) If a manufacturer manufactures methanol powered automobiles, the fuel economy of such vehicles as determined

under this title shall be based on the non-methanol fuel content of the methanol mixture used to operate such automobiles. For purposes of this section, a gallon of the methanol mixture used to operate such automobiles shall be considered to contain 15 one-hundredths of a gallon of non-methanol fuel."

SEC. 5. USE OF NON-STANDARD FUELS.

All passenger automobiles and light-duty trucks acquired by the United States after October 1, 1986, shall be guaranteed or warranted as suitable for operation on all fuels for which waivers issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 211(f) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(f)) are then currently in effect.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: title—Methanol Energy Policy Act of 1985.

Section 2: findings and purposes.

Section 3: amends Title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 by adding a new part, Part J—Encouraging the Use of Methanol, with the following sections:

Section 400AA: requires the Secretary of Energy to ensure the purchase of at least 5,000 methanol-powered passenger cars and light duty trucks per year between FY87 and FY90.

The Secretary must submit semi-annual reports to Congress on the performance, fuel economy, safety, emissions and comparative costs of these vehicles to others.

Methanol must be made available to the public at the same locations where the government-acquired vehicles are supplied with methanol.

Any government agency participating in the demonstration program shall not be required to pay more than the cost of a similar gasoline-powered vehicle.

As an inducement to acquire these vehicles, one-half of the methanol vehicles acquired by an agency shall not be counted against any numerical limitations imposed on that agency.

These vehicles acquired are exempt from meeting the federal fleet average fuel economy standards pursuant to the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act and also from any limitation on the cost allowed for the purchasing of government vehicles.

Section 400AA: authorizes appropriations of \$10 million in FY87; \$8 million in FY88; \$5 million in FY89; \$5 million in FY90 to carry out these provisions.

Section 400BB: authorizes appropriations of \$2 million to establish a demonstration program for the operation of methanol-fueled diesel trucks on a long-haul, high density interstate truck route. This demonstration is to be done by the Secretary of Energy in coordination with commercial operators.

Methanol fuel facilities established to provide fuel for those vehicles shall also be available to the public for use in other vehicles, except in cases where security considerations require otherwise.

Section 400CC: authorizes appropriations of \$4 million for the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to establish a four year pilot program of at least 5 methanol-powered buses. The buses are to be used in urban areas and tested for emissions and fuel economy.

Section 400DD: requires that areas defined as nonattainment areas in the Clean Air Act must purchase methanol buses with UMPTA funding starting in January 1,

1991. Sec. of Energy can decide if not feasible.

Such sums as necessary for fiscal years 91, 92, 93 are authorized to cover the incremental costs of methanol buses over conventional buses. It is expected that the committee will determine the appropriate funding level subsequent to the hearing process.

Section 400EE: establishes an Interagency Commission on Methanol to assist in the development of a national methanol policy and to coordinate efforts to implement such policy. The Commission shall be comprised of representatives from the Departments of Energy, Defense, Interior and Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, Postmaster General, General Services Administration, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and any others appointed to the Commission by the Secretary of Energy.

The Commission shall review a variety of issues including the economics of the production and use of methanol as an alternative fuel, the promotion of methanol-powered vehicles, the environmental and safety aspects of methanol, and long-term planning for commercialization.

Section 400EE also requires the Chairperson of the Commission to establish a Private Sector Advisory Panel to coordinate efforts of the industry with the Federal program.

The Commission must submit annual reports to Congress on the actions taken and findings made by the Commission. All studies undertaken by the Commission are to be made available to the public at an appropriate time determined by the Secretary.

Section 400FF: requires the Secretary of Energy to submit a cost comparison study of natural gas-based methanol, coal-based methanol, and methanol from other resources, to include an evaluation of the various sizes of production facilities.

A study shall also be undertaken by the Secretary to determine the feasibility of a relocatable natural gas to methanol plant which is capable of using domestic supplies of unutilized natural gas.

This section also requires the EPA to prepare a comprehensive analysis on methanol versus gasoline or diesel fuel, with respect to emissions, air quality impact, and health risks associated with a significant amount of use of methanol as a transportation fuel.

A sum of \$975,000 is authorized to be appropriated to conduct the studies required in this section.

Section 4: amends the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act by adding a new subparagraph to address fuel economy standards for vehicles capable of running on methanol. Calculations of fuel economy standards for methanol are to be based on the non-methanol fuel content of the methanol mixture.

Section 5: requires that any vehicles purchased by the Federal Government after Oct. 1, 1986, be guaranteed or warranted to operate on all fuels approved by the Environmental Protection Agency.

MAY 25, 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. RUCKELSHAUS: I understand that the Office of Mobile Resources is working on a Corporate Average Fuel Economy [CAFE] standard equivalency factor for methanol.

During consideration of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act in 1975, I was the author of the amendment which established

the CAFE standards. The real danger to the U.S. was then and still is dependence on imported oil. The primary goal of enacting CAFE standards was to reduce oil imports. Consequently I believe any vehicle which does not use petroleum as fuel would help to achieve the Congress' original objective regardless of its rated miles per gallon.

In order to advance the use of methanol as an automotive fuel, the government must help overcome what a witness at one of our hearings called "everyone's desire to go second." The CAFE standards provide an ideal opportunity to give the auto manufacturers an incentive to go first, i.e., to want to lead rather than follow in the development of an automotive methanol market.

I strongly urge the EPA to provide a major incentive to the auto manufacturers by altering the CAFE formula in the alternative manner suggested in your notice of proposed rulemaking. Rather than establishing an equivalency factor based on the relative amounts of energy in methanol and gasoline, which would merely prevent creation of a disincentive to methanol use, a positive incentive should be created by calculating fuel economy on the basis of miles per gallon of petroleum derived fuel.

This policy would be consistent with the reason for the adoption of the CAFE standards as well as help achieve the air quality and energy security benefits of increased methanol use.

Sincerely,

PHILIP R. SHARP,
Chairman.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my colleague from Indiana, PHIL SHARP, today in introducing a very progressive piece of legislation on the subject of increasing methanol use and production. We are introducing the Methanol Energy Policy Act of 1985 today in response to what we feel is an emerging market and technology—the production and use of methanol—hopefully, methanol made from coal and natural gas, of which my state has huge reserves.

Earlier this session, I introduced a bill—H.R. 2957—designed to give American auto manufacturers a break if they start to produce cars that run on methanol. My experience with driving a methanol-powered Ford Escort in my congressional district over the Easter recess convinced me that the fuel not only has great promise as a substitute for petroleum-based fuels (the currency of middle-eastern blackmail) but also could create thousands of jobs in the coal and natural gas fields of our country. Under H.R. 2957, the so-called corporate average fuel economy [CAFE] standard would be revised to give car manufacturers who, under CAFE, must meet certain mileage standards using the average of the miles-per-gallon ratings of all the models they produce, a credit toward meeting this industrywide standard. My bill, H.R. 2957, has been incorporated into this new piece of legislation.

But there is more. The Methanol Energy Policy Act of 1985 would encourage the use of methanol in other ways. Our legislation would require the Secretary of Energy to ensure the purchase of at least 5,000 methanol-powered passenger cars and light duty trucks per year between 1987 and 1990. The

bill would require the Secretary to submit reports to the Congress on the performance, fuel economy, safety, emissions, and comparative costs of these vehicles to others. Methanol distribution would be enhanced, making the fuel available to the public at locations where Government-acquired vehicles fill up.

Another section of the bill would set up a demonstration program for methanol-fueled diesel trucks to investigate the fuel's applicability to heavy transport. The EPA would be responsible for coordinating a similar methanol-powered bus program.

Our legislation seeks to develop a national agenda for increased methanol use, and is broad range in scope. Methanol will be on trial as this program is instituted, and I am confident that it will emerge as what I have been calling it all along—the fuel of the future.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today a bipartisan coalition takes a major step toward energy independence and enhanced air quality with the introduction of comprehensive methanol legislation. I am pleased to be a part of this coalition as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and as a Representative from California, the State that leads the Nation in methanol development.

Despite the headlines about an oil glut and falling prices, we face an uncertain and unstable energy future in the absence of long-range plans and policies to provide for our needs in the next decade and beyond. In addition, our oil imports are still almost one-third of our daily demand, at a cost of almost \$60 billion last year when the United States ran up a record \$123 billion trade deficit. With the trade deficit estimated to climb to \$150 billion, and perhaps higher, in 1985, anything we can do to reduce oil imports in a responsible manner deserves our attention.

Methanol is an alternative fuel that can reduce our oil imports by providing a reliable transportation fuel. Fleets of methanol cars and buses have been operating successfully in California for several years by the private sector with the Bank of America and by the public sector through a program run by the California Energy Commission. Methanol can be made from natural gas or coal, among other feedstocks. The United States has a current surplus of natural gas and has been described as the Saudi Arabia of coal. As a cleaner burning fuel, methanol permits greater use of coal in an environmentally sound manner.

While energy benefits are important, I am particularly interested in the environmental benefits of cleaner burning fuels such as methanol. I represent an area of southern California which is a nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act. We will not be able to achieve Federal air quality standards without alternate fuels. The use of methanol as part of an air quality strategy has been supported by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the California Lung Association, among others.

The promise of methanol will not become a reality unless a vehicle can be delivered

to consumers at a price comparable to conventional gasoline models. The same goes for the cost of the fuel itself. Additional on-the-road experience is essential to determining how to expand the use of methanol and fleets are a good way to acquire such information. Thus, the bill requires the Federal Government to purchase 5,000 methanol cars each year during fiscal years 1987 through 1990 out of the cars it would otherwise purchase. The bill mandates studies associated with the fleet.

Since diesel emissions from trucks and buses are a disproportionate source of air emissions, particularly in urban areas like Los Angeles and San Francisco, the bill mandates that buses purchased with Federal funds after January 1, 1991, be methanol-powered unless tests on an earlier fleet of buses show that this would cause specified adverse impacts.

This legislation is the culmination of a series of hearings dating back to the 97th Congress and is a combined effort of those who sponsored and cosponsored individual bills in the last Congress. Given this background, and the fact that a methanol bill is moving in the other body, I am extremely hopeful that we can enact methanol legislation into law in the near future.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Methanol Energy Policy Act of 1985. I am pleased to be joined by Mr. SHARP, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, and several other of my colleagues. I wish to especially applaud Mr. SHARP for his hard work and dedication to the methanol issue and to the formulation of this bill.

It is imperative for the Federal Government to actively encourage the use of alternative transportation and industrial fuels to lessen our dependency on foreign oil. One such fuel, available today, is methanol. Methanol is an organic compound which is widely used as a chemical solvent and in the production of a broad range of industrial chemical products. Although most of the world's current methanol capacity is based on surplus natural gas, methanol can be produced from a variety of other raw materials, including coal, petroleum, and biomass.

Methanol has real advantages over conventional fuels used in transportation and industrial applications. As a transportation fuel, it is currently being used in both public and private fleets in California with encouraging results. I am equally excited about the significant environmental advantages being experienced. Methanol burns cleaner and at a lower temperature than gasoline or diesel fuels, producing less nitrogen oxides, and negligible particulate and hydrocarbon emissions. This means improved health for the American people and hope for areas such as southern California and Houston, which experience a great deal of smog caused by automobile-related pollutants.

This bill contains several important provisions. It requires the Federal Government to purchase 5,000 methanol vehicles per year, in place of planned purchases of gas-

oline vehicles, beginning in fiscal year 1987. It establishes both a long-haul truck demonstration program and a methanol-powered bus pilot program. After January 1, 1991, this legislation would require that all new intracity urban buses purchased with Federal funds be methanol-powered. This is extremely important from an environmental standpoint. If, over a number of years, we can replace our urban buses, which are now diesel powered, with methanol-powered vehicles, the environmental benefits to our cities will be enormous. No more clouds of black smoke as the bus pulls away from the stop. It is also important to point out that the Federal Government pays 80 percent of the cost of new city buses and 50 percent of the operation and maintenance costs, so we are not trying to tell local transit authorities what to do with their local funds. Under this bill, the Federal Government would also pay all incremental costs associated with purchasing methanol buses, costs which we expect to disappear after just a few years.

I urge my colleagues to look carefully at this legislation and join us in guaranteeing a decreased dependence on foreign oil and a cleaner environment by advancing methanol use.

THE RETIREMENT OF FRANK JOHNSON FROM THE ARIZONA DAILY STAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this year a distinguished and important member of the Arizona press corps, Frank Johnson, will write another page in his career as he retires from 39 years of deadlines at the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson.

I've known Frank as an editor of unshakable ethics, courage, and decency and one who never overlooked common sense. If some editors might shy from controversy, Frank would more likely ask why it wasn't on page 1. I will miss Frank Johnson. I wish him and his wife, Louise, the best of what they seek in all the years ahead.

In appreciation of this special newspaperman and good friend, I have asked George Ridge, a professor of journalism at the University of Arizona and a former Star city editor under Johnson, to write the following tribute:

FRANK JOHNSON

(A tribute, by George Ridge, Professor of Journalism, University of Arizona, Tucson)

Frank Johnson is retiring on December 31, 1985, after 39 years and 109 days at The Arizona Daily Star. In his time, Frank has been a police reporter, a feature writer, a travel writer, a general assignment reporter, an entertainment writer, a city editor, an assistant managing editor, a managing editor, an executive managing editor and an executive editor of the Star. News writing has been described by some as "instant history," but while he was writing history under deadline pressure, Frank Johnson made a

little bit of history himself. And Frank's calm, professional approach to news also helped a lot of young reporters along their way.

"There are some guys with leadership born in them," says Don Robinson, who was hired by Frank at the Star 27 years ago. "I can remember back when Frank insisted that the cop reporters go out to all the robberies, even when it was 15 minutes to deadline. One time I called Frank from a pay phone on Miracle Mile with my hands shaking, it was so close to deadline. He was so casual that he could always put you at ease. He made it sound so easy, and he did that for all of us."

"Frank was our surrogate father, our loan officer, our psychiatrist, our sociologist, our marriage (and divorce) counselor, our bail bondsman," said Ken Burton. "You could take anything to Frank, and we all did. He would always take the time to listen—to anything. It was a very personal quality that made us feel as if we weren't just employees, but part of a family. It was special."

"The other thing I remember about Frank was that I never once saw the man explode, pound his fist, throw something or even raise his voice under pressure. He was so unflappable it was startling. If ever there was a guy who personified grace under fire, it was Frank Johnson."

Maybe this was because Frank had to grow up fast himself. At 23, he was the top sergeant for a Field Artillery unit on Guadalcanal. Every reporter who ever worked with Frank remembers his coolness under pressure, the way Frank can take over a newsroom amid any crisis and calmly get the news out.

Many reporters have forgotten that Frank was once a young reporter himself, having started at the Star on September 12, 1946. It was in 1948 that Frank set the never-surpassed record of 11 byline stories in one issue of the newspaper, according to Jack Sheaffer, whose memory substitutes for the Guinness Book of Star Records. It would have been only 10 bylines that day, says Jack, but Frank was out drinking beer after work and a light plane crashed in the parking lot of the Pioneer Hotel. He grabbed the telephone for byline No. 11.

The Star soon recognized what a natural Frank was, and made him city editor in 1950 at the tender age of 30. He took to this so well that, in the words of his wife, Louise, "someone could have committed murder on his desk and Frank would just have assigned a reporter to cover it."

Hal Marshall, who succeeded Frank as city editor, says that when he was hired the first thing Frank gave him was a picture of a local mobster, admonishing his new reporter to learn the local scene and the faces that go with it. "I carried that picture in my wallet for 10 years," recalls Marshall. "Right next to the pictures of my kids."

Not to be trifled with, Frank grew upset when one reporter would arrive for work, grab a newspaper and spend about an hour in the lavatory reading it. This ended when Frank rolled a firecracker under the door. Oldtimers still remember the reporter scrambling into the newsroom.

Frank's guidance was not limited to Star staffers. When Bill Greer was elevated from probationary Associated Press reporter to Tucson correspondent, Frank invited him into the office for a congratulatory word. At the end of the conversation, Frank lifted a knitted poodle cover that sat mysteriously on his desk—and the cover masked a bottle of whiskey. "If there's ever a time when it

gets real rough out there and you really need it, this is here for emergency purposes," he advised Greer—who never saw the cover lifted again.

Sheaffer and Frank were in the tragic accident at the Star on July 22, 1982, that left both of them severely burned. Sheaffer recalls that he and Frank had been in a hundred scrapes through their careers, and always made it through.

Like the time in Mexico City, when the plane blew a tire just after liftoff for Merida. The pilot set it back down in a swamp at the end of the runway, and came on the intercom to announce to a startled audience: "Ladies and gentlemen, we have a flat tire."

Or the time in Montreal at Expo 67 that Frank wanted a closeup of the ice breaking up in the river. Sheaffer realized that he had miscalculated his location vis-a-vis the riverbank when his tripod started floating away from him. "I would have been a goner," he says, "but Frank jumped down and grabbed me and pulled me off the slippery ice to the bank."

In another episode, Frank—who always managed to keep the erect, slim figure of a topkick—could never understand how the portly Sheaffer got through the bars of a gate at a political rally in Hermosillo when Frank was pinned against the same gate by a crowd out of control.

Frank brought David Dare to Tucson, and the name still echoes when reporters get together to talk of legendary news feats. While city editor, Frank sent reporters under cover to inspect conditions in the migrant camps. Since the reporters' lives might be in danger, Frank credited the stories to a fictitious "David Dare." For years David Dare remained on the Star's assignment board, and Frank would pen in a facetious destination for him every day.

Frank gave Don Robinson so much confidence that it backfired. "Frank hired me and four weeks later tried to fire me," laughs Robinson. "But he had already built my confidence up so much that I wouldn't let him. I talked him out of it."

"You know, a little while back I said to him, 'Frank, it was just 25 years ago today that you hired me.' Frank always did have a ready reply. 'Where did I go wrong?' he asked."

"There really is leadership born in some guys," Robinson said. Frank had the ability to chew you out without humiliating you. In the old days he would walk from his desk to the copy desk with the stories. If he detoured by me, I knew I had misspelled a word. All he ever did was tap me on the head with that rolled up story and ask, 'How do you spell receive?' By God, I looked it up and never forgot how to spell it. There is something about the guy. You always wanted to do your best for Frank."

[Based on the memories of Hal Marshall, Jack Sheaffer, Barbara Sears, Jacqi Cobble-dick, Jane Kay, Eddie Gallardo, Bill Greer, Ken Burton and Don Robinson.]

TRIBUTE TO JACK PAXTON, EDITOR, THE PADUCAH SUN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, a box atop the editorial page of the Paducah Sun, the most widely read daily newspaper in western Kentucky and ex-

treme southern Illinois, reads: Edwin J. Paxton, editor and publisher 1900-61; Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., editor 1961-77; Jack Paxton, editor 1977-85.

Actually, three men named Edwin J. Paxton have served as editor of the Paducah Sun since 1900. Jack Paxton was Edwin J. Paxton III but preferred the less formal name.

My wife Carol and I attended a wedding in La Center, KY, last Saturday night. It was the marriage of two newspaper publishers—Judy Magee of Wickliffe and Larry Stone of Central City. After the wedding, outside St. Mary's Catholic Church, my wife and I were told by several La Center residents that they had heard on a Paducah radio station that Jack Paxton, age 46, had been killed in an airplane crash south of Paducah. Such news was difficult to believe and/or accept.

By late Saturday night, September 14, it was statewide news in Kentucky that Jack Paxton was killed when a small plane he owned crashed on a farm near Paducah. A witness to the crash, Joy Pullen, said: "All of sudden, I heard its motors go out."

Tributes to Jack Paxton soon began to pour in from all sections of the United States.

Tom Brokaw, anchor of NBC Nightly News, was a friend of Paxton's with whom he worked for 10 years when both were news correspondents for NBC in New York City. Brokaw remembered Paxton as a "go anywhere, do anything risk-taker who would have done very well if he would have stayed with us at NBC in New York."

Kentucky Governor Martha Layne Collins said Monday that "Paxton was a positive force for progress and economic development in Paducah and western Kentucky." Governor Collins added: "His leadership and fellowship will truly be missed."

Former Kentucky Governor John Y. Brown, Jr., who appointed Paxton to the Kentucky Personnel Board and had asked Paxton to be secretary of his executive cabinet, said:

It just doesn't seem fair for something like that to happen to someone with such talent and productive ability. Jack Paxton could have done anything that he wanted to do, but he chose to be a leader in his own community.

Former Kentucky Governor Julian M. Carroll, a native of Heath—just west of Paducah, said he had asked Paxton years ago to be his press secretary. Julian Carroll added:

He didn't want to be in a posture to be involved with one politician or one political party. His uneasiness with political labels was the main reason he successfully brought about the renaming of the Paducah newspaper from the Sun-Democrat to the Sun. He did that because he didn't want anyone to think that the newspaper represented the views of the Democratic Party.

Former Governor Carroll appointed Paxton to the board of directors of the

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Authority on August 30, 1979. Paxton continued to serve on that board until his death.

Hundreds of people who liked and admired Jack Paxton have paid tribute to him following his untimely and tragic death. Not only was Jack Paxton praised during the past 3 days by the Governor and former Governors of Kentucky but also by those of all walks of life—elderly Paducahans living on Social Security, firemen, business leaders, minimum-wage workers, clergy, teachers, and those many who worked with him and under his leadership at the Paducah Sun.

Allan Rhodes, Sr., president of Paducah-McCracken County Growth, Inc., credited Paxton with "laying the groundwork for the formation of the nonprofit group to help keep downtown Paducah alive."

Bob Green, developer of the largest hotel in my 24-county congressional district—the huge Executive Inn of Paducah, said he wouldn't have built the hotel but for the active efforts of Paxton and the late Judge-Executive Raymond C. Schultz (who died only last December 14).

Time will allow only a few more deserving tributes from my constituents regarding Jack Paxton.

Fred Paxton, chairman of the NBC Affiliates Board from 1980-84, president and managing director of Paducah's WPSD-TV, and president and publisher of the Paducah Sun:

He (Jack Paxton) was a forceful man who drove toward conclusions. And once decisions were made, he saw to it that they stuck. Yet he carried within him a rare perception of the needs and concerns of others. His tenderness to those in need, or even in doubt, belied his great stature and physical strength. He campaigned for the poor and helpless and, eschewing publicity, worked to raise uncounted thousands of dollars for neglected youths, homeless adults, battered wives and other hapless souls.

Don Pepper, editorial writer for the Paducah Sun:

Jack . . . Did believe in truth. He believed that some things are right and others wrong. He believed in dealing honestly and fairly with every person. He despised the human habit of erecting barriers between people, which is what religious people call sin. He did believe that there are values in life that are worth striving for. Why they are, or how they came to be bound into the fabric of life itself he'd probably say he didn't know. These elusive strands of belief and faith gave Jack a special sensitivity to other people.

Bill Powell, the dean of journalists in western Kentucky and who for many years was a highly respected reporter for the Paducah Sun and the (Louisville) Courier-Journal:

I had known Jack since he was 10 years old. Even as a youngster he impressed me as being very bright and very fair. I had no doubts that he would fulfill his goals. I watched him grow up during the 28 years that I worked for his grandfather and

father (at the Paducah Sun-Democrat). I thought he was one of the best correspondents NBC had, but I was glad to see him come back home. He was good for the Sun. I have to compare him especially to his grandfather (E. J. Paxton, Sr.), who as early as 1900 was pushing for development of downtown, and bringing new industry and jobs to the city, the very things Jack was pushing for up to the day he died. Above all, I admired his fairness and ability to get along with others. He made life more fun for all of us.

Rev. Tim Tayloer, the popular and brilliant pastor of Grace Episcopal Church in Paducah, told about 500 who attended a memorial service at the church yesterday:

Jack Paxton . . . had a talent for friendship, with people in all walks of life, and so we have come together from many circumstances . . . to salute a friend. He had already journeyed far . . . but he came home—home to roots, to the place where the deep things of life abide and prosper. And then he became, at a still young age, one of the guardians, those who watch and work and take care for the preservation and prosperity of the good community, so that the children who come after us may have a clean and wholesome and loving place in which to grow up; may learn to know and honor truth and honesty and courage and compassion; may become all they can be.

Paxton is survived by a young and very attractive wife, Debbie Paxton, who is referred to by an editorial yesterday in the Paducah Sun, written by Fred Paxton as "an ebullient, charming, understanding young lady." Also surviving are two well-known western Kentuckians—Josh Paxton, age 8, and Adam Paxton, age 3, the two sons about whom Jack Paxton enjoyed writing in his frequent columns in the Paducah Sun. Jack's parents and two sisters also mourn his death. Jack's father, Edwin J. Paxton, Jr., though living in Cocoa Beach, FL, now, is still remembered by western Kentuckians for his 17 years of outstanding leadership as editor of the Paducah Sun. Much more could be said of Ed Paxton and his lovely mother, Evelyn Goodman Paxton.

As Congressman for western Kentucky I speak for thousands in saying now that Jack Paxton was an outstanding citizen whose opinions and writings had a very positive influence on western Kentucky and southern Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I liked and admired Jack Paxton. He could tell it like it is in writing better than any journalist I have ever read.

Jack Paxton was the most effective—always behind the scenes—promoter of progress for downtown Paducah.

Jack Paxton's death at age 46 is a vivid reminder to us as to the uncertainty of life.

□ 1735

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBBARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I thank my distinguished neighbor from Kentucky for yielding, and I want to join all of our colleagues in commending him for taking this time to pay tribute to a great American. Although my district is across the river from Paducah, in southern Illinois, Jack Paxton's work is well known. I am reminded of the old biblical phrase that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And Jack Paxton was that type of an individual. As you so ably pointed out in your remarks earlier, there was no task too small for him, whether it was helping some lowly person along the street or working for economic development or the Tombigbee Waterway, which is a great billion-dollar program for navigation along the inland waters of this great country, and I want to join with you in extending sympathy to all of the members of the Paxton family and say that although this light has gone out, I am sure that the memories he has left will be long remembered in the way of development for our region.

I thank you so much for taking out this special order.

Mr. HUBBARD. I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] my neighbor across the Ohio River, for his statements in joining with me in expressing sympathy to the wife, the children, the parents and other members of the Paxton family.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEHMAN of California (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for September 18, 19, and 20, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DeWINE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, for 60 minutes, on September 19.

Mr. RUDD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENNY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WIRTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHARP, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HUBBARD, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, on September 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEWINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TAUKE.
Mr. BADHAM.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in seven instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. COURTER.
Mr. DORNAN of California.
Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. McGRATH.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. COATS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENNY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. FLORIO in two instances.
Mrs. BURTON of California.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. BRYANT.
Mr. EDGAR in two instances.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. MARKEY in two instances.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. BEDELL in two instances.
Mr. DYSON.
Mr. SHELBY.
Mr. WEISS.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 1985, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2009. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Logistics and Communications), transmitting notice of the decision to convert to contractor performance the protective coating function at

the U.S. Air Force Academy, CO, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2010. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of the intent to issue commercial export license for sale of major defense equipment to the Government of Portugal (Transmittal No. MC-27-85), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2011. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of the intent to issue commercial export license for sale of major defense equipment to the Government of Spain (Transmittal No. MC-28-85), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2012. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the justification for an increase in the allocation of foreign assistance for Grenada, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2013. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting the justification for changes in the allocation of foreign assistance for Jamaica, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2014. A letter from the Chairperson, Navy Resale and Services Support Office Retirement Trust, transmitting the annual report on the Navy Resale and Services Support Office, Retirement Trust, Department of the Navy, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2015. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting notification that the court will open the October 1985 term on October 7, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2016. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a series of eight bills which comprise the administration's antifraud enforcement initiative; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2100. A bill to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers and abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rep. 99-271, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rep. 99-274).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEFNER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3327. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3325. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide that States shall establish certain requirements respecting all-terrain vehicles as a condition to the receipt of funds for highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 3326. A bill to provide assistance to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education to promote the development and use of education technology by elementary and secondary school students and their teachers, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. HEFNER:

H.R. 3327. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3329. A bill to declare a portion of the Middle River, Maryland, as a nonnavigable waterway of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3330. A bill entitled: the "Nuclear Power Plant Security and Anti-Terrorism Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 3331. A bill to designate the United States Post Office Building located at 2120 South Ervay in Dallas, TX, as the "Juanita Craft Post Office of South Dallas"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 3332. A bill to transfer title, control, and custody of certain lands near Aiken, SC, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to the U.S. Department of Energy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 3333. A bill to require persons who obtain or renew oil or gas leases with the United States to have a plan for contracting with minority firms for activities undertaken under the leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. DANNEMEYER):

H.R. 3334. A bill entitled: the "False Claims Act Amendments of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 3335. A bill entitled: the "Program Fraud Civil Penalties Act of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3336. A bill entitled: the "Bribes and Gratuities Act of 1985"; jointly, to the Committee on the Judiciary, and Armed Services.

By Mr. FISH (by request):

H.R. 3337. A bill entitled: the "Contract Disputes Act and Federal Courts Improvement Act Amendments of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 3338. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 3339. A bill to amend the copyright law respecting the limitations on exclusive rights to secondary transmissions; to amend the Communications Act of 1934 respecting retransmission of programs originated by broadcast stations; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. DANNEMEYER):

H.R. 3340. A bill entitled: the "Grand Jury Disclosure Amendments of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DEWINE):

H.R. 3341. A bill entitled: the "Anti-Fraud Criminal Enforcement Act of 1985"; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Armed Services.

By Mr. KINDNESS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DEWINE):

H.R. 3342. A bill entitled: the "Debt Collection Act Amendments of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 3343. A bill to provide that procurement of the new United States weather radar system, NEXRAD, continue on schedule and according to the established minimum requirements agreed to by the National Weather Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself, and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 3344. A bill to establish the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

H.R. 3345. A bill to establish an Advisory Commission on tactical Nuclear Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3346. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit funding for the United States proportionate share for certain programs for Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3347. A bill to repeal the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 which authorizes the activities of the Office of Technology Assessment; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

H.R. 3348. A bill to provide a tax credit for retraining expenses for individuals who are unemployed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 3349. A bill to establish the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 3350. A bill to promote expansion of international trade in telecommunications equipment and services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3351. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 regarding the broadcasting of certain material regarding candidates for Federal elective office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 3352. A bill to transfer certain real property to the city of Mesquite, NV; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 3353. A bill to establish the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3354. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens popularly known as "Silva Class Members", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 3355. A bill to develop a national methanol energy policy and to coordinate efforts to implement such policy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 3356. A bill to designate the public park known as the Stinson Creek Recreation Area and located at Columbus Lake in Lowndes County, MS, as the Lloyd D. Hayes Recreation Area; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 3357. A bill to require the Federal Government to enter into contracts with the private sector for procurement of property and services needed by the Federal Government when any cost comparison demonstrates that the cost of such procurement from private sector sources is lower than the cost of providing such property or services by the Government, and to establish in the procurement policy of the Federal Government a greater reliance on private sector sources to provide property and services needed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, and Mr. BREAU):

H.R. 3358. A bill to reauthorize the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H.R. 3359. A bill to establish a special advisory council to study and make recommendations with respect to the medical and vocational aspects of disability under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act, and with respect to the so-called notch problem in the computation of social security benefit amounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 3360. A bill to designate the Public Health Service facility in Carville, LA, as the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equal access by voluntary student religious groups and moments of silence which may be used for voluntary silent prayer or reflection in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to designate November 21, 1985, as "William Beaumont Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARNES:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for an early and peaceful return of democratic rule in Chile; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning the appropriation of additional funds for the United States contribution to the seventh replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution urging the President to commence promptly a new round of multilateral trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3361. A bill for the relief of Pelican Party Boat Corp. and the vessel *Eliminator*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOSCO:

H.R. 3362. A bill to permit three specified vessels to be scrapped in the foreign market; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Hamilton Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY:

H.R. 3364. A bill for the relief of Pietro Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Moun-taha Bou-Assali Saad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. ERDREICH.
H.R. 66: Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CROCKETT.
H.R. 67: Mr. SHARP, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CROCKETT.
H.R. 156: Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 161: Mr. CROCKETT.
H.R. 338: Mr. CARPER.
H.R. 585: Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. SCHUETTE.
H.R. 605: Mr. HENDON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. BLAZ.
H.R. 780: Mr. OLIN and Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 825: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
H.R. 877: Mr. SCHUETTE and Mr. HUBBARD.
H.R. 933: Mr. ATKINS.
H.R. 945: Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MONSON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. McCLOSKEY.
H.R. 979: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1071: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 1188: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SABO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. STOKES.
H.R. 1284: Mr. REID and Mr. DURBIN.
H.R. 1318: Mr. FIELDS and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1423: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1457: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 1478: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1551: Mr. BADHAM, DANIEL, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 1562: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. LOEFFLER.
H.R. 1579: Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. EDGAR.
H.R. 1616: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.
H.R. 1809: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1908: Mr. FIELDS.
H.R. 1918: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. DAUB, Mr. REID, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1985: Mr. STUDDS and Mr. VANDER JAGT.
H.R. 2164: Mr. HENDON.
H.R. 2205: Mr. APPELATE, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. SCHUETTE.
H.R. 2263: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.
H.R. 2440: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DICKS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 2539: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 2557: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan and Mr. TORRES.
H.R. 2567: Mr. FEIGHAN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 2617: Mr. SHAW, Mr. AuCOIN, and Mr. LOTT.
H.R. 2684: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SENSEN-BRENNER, and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.
H.R. 2793: Mr. MONSON and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 2826: Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 2854: Mr. PASHAYAN.
H.R. 2939: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. FISH.
H.R. 2954: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. BENTLEY.
H.R. 3032: Mr. PERKINS and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 3035: Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3045: Mr. SMITH of Florida.
H.R. 3172: Mr. COURTER.
H.R. 3173: Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. GINGRICH.
H.R. 3202: Mr. GROTEBERG, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.
H.R. 3298: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. DAUB, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. SCHUETTE.
H.J. Res. 126: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. DORNAN of California.
H.J. Res. 172: Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DYALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.J. Res. 175: Mr. PICKLE.
H.J. Res. 179: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and Mr. PETRI.
H.J. Res. 207: Mr. DYSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BROWN of California.
H.J. Res. 218: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.J. Res. 221: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HILER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WIRTH.
H.J. Res. 267: Mr. BATEMAN.
H.J. Res. 277: Mr. SAVAGE.
H.J. Res. 296: Mr. LUKE.
H.J. Res. 297: Mr. HENDON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. SHARP.
H.J. Res. 306: Mr. WEISS and Mr. BADHAM.
H.J. Res. 363: Mr. McGRATH, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ECKERT of New York.
H.J. Res. 377: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. APPELATE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DAUB, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. MONSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.J. Res. 381: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, and Mrs. BOXER.
H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. SCHUMER.
H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. CHAPPIE.
H. Res. 105: Mr. HATCHER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

209. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Legislative Research Commission, Frankfort, KY, relative to the deductibility of certain local taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

210. Also, petition of the Confederation of Asia-Pacific Chambers of Commerce and Industry, Taipei, Taiwan, relative to textiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2100

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

—On pages 53 and 54, beginning with line 4 on page 53, delete all of Sec. 231 and insert the following:

SEC. 231. (a) Section 8c(5)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(5)(A)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by adding at the end the following: "Throughout the 2-year period beginning on the effective date of this sentence (and subsequent to such 2-year period unless modified by amendment to the order involved), the minimum aggregate amount of the adjustments, under clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence, to prices for milk of the highest use classification under orders that are in effect under this section on the date of the enactment of the Dairy Unity Act of 1985 shall be as follows:

Marketing Areas Subject to Order	Minimum Aggregate Amount of Such Adjustments Per Hundredweight of Milk Having 3.5 Per Centum Milkfat
New England	3.00
New York-New Jersey	2.84
Middle Atlantic	2.78
Georgia	2.60
Alabama-West Florida	2.60
Upper Florida	3.30
Tampa Bay	3.60
Southeastern Florida	3.90
Michigan Upper Peninsula	1.35
Southern Michigan	1.60
Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania	1.85
Ohio Valley	1.70
Indiana	1.53
Chicago Regional	1.26
Southern Illinois	1.53
Louisville-Lexington-Evansville	1.95
Upper Midwest	1.12
Eastern South Dakota	1.40
Black Hills	1.95
Iowa	1.40
Nebraska-Western Iowa	1.60
Greater Kansas City	1.74
Tennessee Valley	2.30
Nashville	2.10
Paducah	1.85
Memphis	2.10
Central Arkansas	1.94
Fort Smith	1.95
Southwest Plains	1.98
Texas Panhandle	2.25
Lubbock-Plainview	2.42
Texas	2.32
Greater Louisiana	2.60

"Marketing Areas Minimum Aggregate
Subject to Order Amount of Such
Adjustments Per
Hundredweight of
Milk Having 3.5
Per Centum
Milkfat

New Orleans-Mississippi.....	3.10
Eastern Colorado.....	2.30
Western Colorado.....	2.00
Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon	1.50
Great Basin.....	1.90
Lake Mead.....	1.60
Central Arizona.....	2.52
Rio Grande Valley.....	2.35
Puget Sound-Inland.....	1.85
Oregon-Washington.....	1.95

Effective at the beginning of such two-year period, the minimum prices for milk of the highest use classification shall be adjusted for the locations at which delivery of such milk is made to such handlers."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. ROTH:

—Page 37, beginning in line 4, strike out "The Secretary" and all that follows

through "Agriculture," in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of agriculture shall, in consultation with the International Trade Commission and the United States Trade Representative, conduct a study to determine what relief should be granted because of the interference of imported casein with the dairy price support program."
—Page 274, after line 12 insert the following:

TRADE LIBERALIZATION

SEC. 1132. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the present high level of agricultural protectionism contrasts sharply with the general trade liberalization that has been achieved since the inception of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter referred to as "GATT");

(2) GATT procedures should explicitly recognize the protective effect of domestic subsidies that alter trade indirectly by reducing the demand for imports and increasing the supply of exports;

(3) current rules make a distinction between primary and manufactured products, and this allows for agricultural export subsidies;

(4) the rule that permits export subsidies on primary products that do not result in inequitable market shares has proven to be unworkable; and

(5) a unified treatment of tariffs and subsidies would clarify trading rules for market participants and simplify trade negotiations.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the President should negotiate with other parties to GATT to revise GATT rules so that agricultural export subsidies would be treated the same as tariffs and primary products the same as manufactured products.

Amend the table of contents at the beginning of the bill accordingly.

H.R. 2266

By Mr. RINALDO:

—Page 11, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. TRANSPORTATION OF UNOCCUPIED VEHICLES.

Section 103(3) of the Rail Passenger Service Act (45 U.S.C. 502(3)) is amended by inserting ", and, when space is available, of unoccupied vehicles" after "and their occupants".